EXHIBIT P

MAR Hearing Transcript Vol. 2 (pp 156-309)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE

COUNTY OF RICHMOND

SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION

FILE NO. 96 CRS 001576

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

versus

TRANSCRIPT

VOLUME II OF III

DERRICK MCRAE

Defendant

Transcript of proceedings in the General Court of Justice, Superior Court Division, Richmond County, North Carolina, at the December 1, 2016 session, before the Honorable David Lee, presiding.

> Patrice B. Lee, CVR-CM Official Court Reporter Superior Court

I N D E X

WIT	NESSES	FOR THE DEFENSE	PAGE
MR.	ROBER'	T VOORHEES	
		Cross Examination	223
		Redirect Examination	230
MR. MICHAEL PARKER			
		Direct Examination	237
		Cross Examination	290
		Redirect Examination	296
		Recross Examination	297
MR.	JAMES	IRVINE VAN CAMP	
		Direct Examination	299
		Cross Examination	306
		Redirect Examination	308
		Recross Examination	308

I N D E X Cont'd

EXHIBITS FOR THE DEFENSE Autopsy Report Medical Examiner Report Reporting Form Felony Report Police File Aerial Photo Transcript Criminal Infraction Synopsis Criminal DR Response Sentencing Order Statement by Mr. Nelson Testimony by Ms. Rankin Statement of Rights Murder Indictment Murder Indictment Witness List ADA Notes Discovery Sheet Oral Statement ADA To Do List Photo of Scene Assignment of Case to SB

(COURT RESUMES AT 9:30 A.M.) 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect the defendant is with us. Are we ready to continue with 3 Mr. Voorhees? 4 5 MR. LAU: Defense is ready. 6 MR. HAIGH: State is ready, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 If you'll come back around here. And you understand 9 that you remain under oath? 10 THE WITNESS: I do. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Have a seat. 12 BY MR. LAU: 1.3 Good morning, Mr. Voorhees. 14 Good morning. 15 Yesterday, at the conclusion of your testimony after 16 you left yesterday, have you spoken with the State with respect 17 to this case since yesterday? 18 Not until I entered the courtroom this morning. 19 And when you entered the courtroom this morning you 20 spoke with attorneys for the State? 2.1 I did. Α 2.2 What was the conversation you had with the State? 23 Α Just asking about the file that you presented me 24 yesterday. 25 And what were those questions?

He asked me if I could say with absolute certainty 1 2 that the file was in the same condition as it was when it was 3 prepared 16 to 18 years ago. Now, yesterday you testified that items had been 5 removed from that file, is that correct? 6 Yes. 7 Now, you also testified that when you were asked 8 about that file five to seven years ago, it was not located at 9 the RPD, is that correct? 10 That's correct. 11 Do you know that file ever leaving the RPD? 12 I wouldn't have direct knowledge of it. It wasn't in 13 my personal care, custody, and control, you know, the file was 14 used during trial. There was original documents in the trial. 15 Those documents could have easily -- photographs, documents, 16 statements -- could have been entered into evidence at the 17 trial and removed from the file at that time. There's dozens 18 of reasons, literally, legitimately, why things could have been 19 removed from that file without my knowledge, and I would never 20 know it and know why it's in the condition that it is today. 21 MR. LAU: If I may approach, Your Honor. 2.2 THE COURT: Yes. 23 BY MR. LAU:

Defendant's Exhibit 25. I submit to you that in Defendant's

Let me hand you what's previously been marked as

24

```
Exhibit 25, there are no records from that period of October
 1
 2
     15th to October 31st after Mr. Rankin's body was found on
 3
     October 14th. Was an investigation taking place during that
 4
     time?
 5
               Yes.
 6
          Q
               And during the course of that investigation, were you
 7
     developing leads of possible suspects?
 8
               I would imagine so, but I can't directly remember.
 9
               You can't directly remember. And you would have been
10
     writing those down?
11
          Α
               Yes.
12
               And that would have been material that was in the
13
     file or would have been placed in the case file?
14
               Among other things, yes.
15
               Among other things. You would also be trying to
16
     figure out what it was that the victim was doing on that day I
17
     would imagine, is that correct?
18
               MR. HAIGH: Objection. Leading, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sustain that.
20
     BY MR. LAU:
21
               Would you have thought to determine what the victim
2.2
     was doing that day?
23
               MR. HAIGH: Objection. Speculation.
24
               THE COURT:
                           I'm going to sustain that. You can't
25
          lead and then turn around and ask it another way, Mr. Lau,
```

1 I think you are aware of that. Let's move along. 2 BY MR. LAU: 3 What would have been done during the first few weeks 4 of the investigation? 5 MR. HAIGH: Same objection, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: I'm going to overrule that. 7 Do you know what went on the first few weeks of the 8 investigation? 9 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I would have to speak 10 generally. I don't have a memory that well to remember 11 incidents 18 years ago, you know, step by step. It would have 12 to be a general overview of what I would normally do during any 13 investigation. BY MR. LAU: 14 15 And, generally, what would you do during the first 16 few weeks of an investigation? 17 Not being the only investigator in this particular 18 case, you know, we would see if we could, at first, figure out 19 what happened on the crime scene, what the incident was to 20 start off with, why individuals that we could put there were 21 there, what occurred leading up to the incident where the 2.2 victim was shot in the head. Subsequently after that, it would 23 be who did it, why they did it, what they did it with. 24 There is also no records in the file from December

1, 1995 until February 21, 1996, with the exception of a

property transfer sheet related to the photos that were taken 1 2 by Phil Sweat from the Sheriff's Department at the crime scene. 3 MR. HAIGH: Objection. Leading again, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to let you answer that, 5 and I'm going to caution you again, don't lead your 6 witness. 7 You're very hung up on those dates, but again, I've already testified that there's numerous reasons why something 8 9 could have been in there at one time and is no longer there, 10 and I don't have direct knowledge to tell you why it's there or 11 not. It may have been there at one time and no longer there. 12 Whether the Court took it out, it was entered as evidence, 13 whether the district attorney used it for a particular reason, 14 whether it was turned over to one of his defense attorneys, I 15 have no direct knowledge of that. I can't testify to it. 16 BY MR. LAU: 17 So, the District Attorney's Office would have had the 18 entire file at some point in time? 19 Well, yeah, they had access to the whole file at one 20 time. The file was used at trial. 2.1 How do you recall the file being used at trial? 2.2 Α I wasn't the trial officer. I don't know. 23 So, you know it was present at trial? Q 24 Yes. Α 25 Now, the master file tabs in that file in front of Q

```
you, can you tell the Court what tabs are in that file in
 1
 2
     Defendant's 25?
 3
               You're saying master tab file?
               The tabs within the file that's marked Defendant's
 4
 5
     Exhibit 25. Can you read what those tabs are for the Court?
 6
               Tabs are crime scene, evidence, witness statement,
 7
     suspect information, victim information, autopsy, reports,
 8
     synopsis, and pictures.
 9
               And you indicated that there is nothing behind those
10
     tabs?
11
               That's correct.
               So, it's your belief that what was behind those tabs
12
13
     has been removed from that file at some point in time as you
     testified, but you don't know when?
14
15
               MR. HAIGH: Objection. Speculation, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Well, I'm going to overrule that. He can
          answer that.
17
18
               I don't know how or when.
          Α
19
               You don't know how?
20
               I don't know how or when anything would have been
21
     removed from the file.
2.2
          Q
               Thank you. Now, further you indicated yesterday that
23
     the investigation continued after the arrest of Mr. McRae, is
24
     that right?
25
          Α
               That's correct.
```

Q What was done after the arrest of Mr. McRae, do you recall?

A That was a generalization, but as a rule in our investigation department, we always would say an arrest does not mean the investigation is over. You have to be open-minded. You have to be always looking for that extra piece of evidence. There has been numerous times were evidence has presented itself or been discovered from the time of arrest, before trial, more witnesses, physical evidence, there is still lab reports coming in, sometimes a handwritten autopsy report or signed off autopsy report doesn't come in till, you know, much later after a murder case. I'm speaking in all general terms. I'm not saying that happened in this case. I can only speak from generally how we would handle the situation because I, again, don't have a lot of memory as far as details.

Q Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 24. Yesterday, you identified that as a felony report from the Rockingham Police Department's investigation, and you identified that is your handwriting, is that accurate?

A That's correct.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Q Would you mind turning to Page 3, it's actually indicated Page 9, which is the number on it from the file we received, but Page 3 of that document, and can you read under where it says, 'State any comments you wish to make concerning

the case about the defendant.' 1 2 'We need to look very closely at the victim in this case.' 3 4 Do recall why you wrote that? 5 No. 6 Was this after the arrest that you conducted that --7 you wrote this felony report? 8 Yes. 9 There is nothing in the Rockingham PD files related 10 to an investigation of the victim. Do you recall any 11 investigation taking place? 12 I'd have to disagree with you there, sir. I did see 13 information on the victim as I perused through those files 14 yesterday, so to say there's not information, it's not correct. 15 After the arrest? 16 I don't know when it was generated. I don't have 17 that knowledge. I know it's in the file, and your statement 18 was it's not in the file. Yes, it is. 19 Is there anything in the file after the arrest? 20 I don't know when it got in the file, sir. 21 Can you find what you're talking about within the 2.2 file? 23 There's a whole record of criminal history for the 24 victim in here, Jerry Rankin. 25 Does that have a date on it from when it was ran?

1 It appears to be 9-16-1995. 2 Do you know when the arrest was made, or let me just 3 direct you to that felony report, Exhibit 24. Now, on that 4 felony report, can you read --5 The date of arrest was March 1, 1996. 6 That was for the codefendant, correct? 7 Α Correct. And what about for Mr. McRae? 8 0 9 February 29, 1996. Α 10 February 29, 1996. So, that criminal history report Q 11 was ran before this felony report was completed? 12 Apparently. 1.3 So, there's nothing in the record from after the 14 arrest was made? 15 You're making a statement. I quess I agree with you, Α 16 again --17 You have the records there? 18 Well, I asked you yesterday if you wanted me to go 19 through them page by page, and I told you that would take a 20 while. I did not look at each and every page. I cannot sit 21 here and tell you exactly what is in the file and what is not 2.2 and when it got there. 23 I asked you yesterday to take Defendant's Exhibit 26, 24 review Defendant's Exhibit 26 along with Defendant's Exhibit 25

and to determine whether or not they were a fair

representation, and you did that. 1 2 MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: I'm aware of what we did yesterday, 4 Counsel, you don't need to go back through that. 5 your next question. 6 BY MR. LAU: 7 Is there anything in the file that you have in front 8 of you indicating that an investigation took place of the victim after you did the felony report? 9 10 I don't know. 11 Why don't you look. 12 Of the documents that are contained in this file, the 13 latest date I can find in the file is March 1, 1996. 14 So, those files have been removed as well? 15 I'm going to testify, again, that I do not know what 16 has been removed, what was added, or what has happened to it 17 while it was not in my care, custody, and control since that 18 time. 19 Did the Rockingham Police Department further 20 investigate the victim after the felony report was completed? 2.1 Yes. They investigated the entire case. 2.2 Q And there's no records of any part of that 23 investigation in what is the Rockingham Police Department's 24 file? 25 There's no records past March 1, 1996 in this file

that you've handed me.

Referring back to your handwriting on Page three of
the felony report, you underlined the victim, where you wrote

the felony report, you underlined the victim, where you wrote the victim, twice. Did you view it important to continue investigating the victim?

A I do not remember.

Q Do you remember Jerry Rankin?

A Yes. I grew up with him.

Q Why would you view it important to continue investigating the victim?

A I do not know why I underlined that particular word. I do not know what was special about the victim that I thought — I don't know if there was a special connection at the time between the suspect and the victim. I don't know if they were involved in something, some transaction. I don't know what led me to that. Anything that I report to you at this time would be speculation and obviously is inappropriate.

Q So, we'll never know?

THE COURT: Don't be argumentative. He's indicated he does not know. I think you've asked him that about three times. I'm going to caution you again move along if you've got another line of question. If not, I'm going to turn it over to the State.

MR. LAU: May I approach.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.1

2.2

BY MR. LAU: 1 2. Mr. Voorhees, I've handed you what's been marked 3 Defendant's Exhibit 5. Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 5? Do recognize that? 4 5 It appears to be a copy of a statement written by 6 Captain RL McQuay. 7 Now, yesterday you testified that you would have been 8 present for the interview, conducted the interview, or spoke 9 with the individual who did the interview about the substance 10 of the interview, is that right? 11 That's correct. Α So, you would have spoken to Captain McQuay after he 12 13 discussed -- after he met with Darius Lockhart? 14 Α Yes. Do you recall why it was that Darius Lockhart was at 15 16 the Rockingham Police Department on this day? 17 Α No. Did he come voluntarily? 18 19 I don't recall. Α 20 Can you read the first sentence beginning with --21 from Defendant's Exhibit 5. 2.2 'Around two or three weeks ago, I was walking down 23 Zion Street with a guy by the name Derrick McRae.' 24 You can stop there. So, about two or three weeks ago 25 he was walking with Derrick McRae. And is there a date on this

1 statement? 2 February 21, 1996. 3 That would have been approximately the beginning of 4 February he and Derrick were together? 5 Two weeks prior to that. 6 Let me ask you to turn to the second page, and the 7 second sentence up from the bottom beginning with, 'A few days 8 later.' Can you read where it says, 'A few days later'? Can you read to the end of the statement? 10 'A few days later, Derrick asked me if I wanted to 11 buy a .380 handgun. He said he had it stashed. I told him no, 12 because the gun was hot.' 1.3 Generally, it's important in investigations to find 14 the murder weapon, if possible; is that correct? 15 Α Yes, sir. 16 Did you ever seek a search warrant to search Derrick 17 McRae's residence for this gun that he had stashed? 18 I personally did not. Α 19 Did anybody at the Rockingham Police Department do 20 it? 2.1 Do not recall. 2.2 Is there anything in the record indicating that? 23 Not in this record you handed me, no, sir. I don't 24 know about the court records, the court documents, or anything 25 else that you have that I may not have laid eyes on.

Was a gun ever recovered in this case? 1 2 I do not recall. 3 MR. LAU: Your Honor, I have a picture here that I 4 would like to show, and I'm just wondering where it would 5 be best for you and the witness. 6 THE COURT: It might be over here. 7 BY MR. LAU: 8 Mr. Voorhees, up on the easel I marked Defendant's 9 Exhibit 27, which is an aerial map of a section of Rockingham 10 that includes the JFK housing development. Are you familiar 11 with this section of Rockingham? 12 Yes, I am. 1.3 Now, if you could, can you get down from the stand 14 and point on that map where Palisade Circle is? 15 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, at this point, I'm going to 16 object to foundation. 17 THE COURT: If you can just tell me what you are 18 offering this for. What you intend to show. 19 MR. LAU: I intended to show that the statements 20 themselves -- we're using this to impeach the statements 2.1 or to establish the materiality of the statements that 2.2 were not turned over to Mr. Crump. We're going to ask him 23 to use this map to illustrate some of the movements that 24 are described by the statements. 25 I'm going to overrule that objection and THE COURT:

```
allow you to do that.
 1
 2
     BY MR. LAU:
 3
               Can you indicate where Palisade Circle is on this
 4
     map?
 5
               This is Palisade Circle.
 6
               And can you indicate where JFK Drive is on this map?
 7
               This is JFK Drive.
 8
               And what about Hood Street?
          0
 9
               Hood Street runs back here.
10
          Q
               And do you know where the victim's home is on this
11
     map?
12
          Α
               It's not on the map.
1.3
               The victim's home is not on this map?
          Q
14
               The victim's home is not on this map.
          Α
15
               Are you certain about that?
          Q
16
               The victim's home is not on this map.
17
               Do you remember approximately where the victim's home
18
     was?
19
               It was on Rockingham Road. It was further up off the
          Α
20
     map directly across from Rockingham Skating Rink.
21
               Thank you. The home of Alan Fishman, where the
2.2
     victim's body was located, is that on that map?
23
          Α
               Yes.
24
               Can you indicate where that is on the map?
25
               I don't know exactly which house it was without a
```

```
house number. Relating to the map, it was one of these houses
 1
 2
     right here.
 3
               Okay.
          Q
 4
               One of those in that row there.
 5
               Do you recall where Derrick McRae lived at the time?
 6
          Α
               No, I don't know.
 7
               For the sake of continuing to review Mr. Lockhart's
 8
     statement, can you grab Defendant's Exhibit 5. Let me change
     course for a minute and hand you what's been marked Defendant's
 9
10
     Exhibit 28. And if I may, let me direct your attention to
11
     Page 137, Line 18?
12
               MR. HAIGH: Mr. Lau, can you please identify this.
1.3
               THE WITNESS: I don't know what this is.
14
     BY MR. LAU:
15
               What I'm handing you is the trial testimony of --
16
     your trial testimony from the second trial of Derrick McRae.
     Do you recall testifying in that trial?
17
18
               Vaguely.
          Α
19
               And on Page 137, Line 18, can you read from Line 18
20
     to Line 23?
21
               Line 18, "Question: And in your investigation of
2.2
     this case, did you have occasion to learn where he was living
23
     in October of 1995?' Continue?
24
               Yes, please.
          Q
```

"Answer: Yes. Where was that, sir? On JFK Drive

25

Α

```
off of Rockingham Road, 906."
 1
 2
               Does that help you remember where it was that Derrick
 3
     McRae was living at the time?
 4
               I can identify it off of this, yes. JFK Drive is
 5
     here (indicating.)
 6
               And you know where 906 JFK Drive is?
 7
          Α
               No.
 8
               No?
 9
               I assume, because of the low number, it would be near
10
     the front of the road, but again, I can't point to the building
11
     and tell you which one is 906.
               Okay. Now, returning to Defendant's Exhibit 5, the
12
13
     last sentence on the first page beginning with, 'Derrick,' can
14
     you read that last sentence?
15
               Last sentence of the first page?
16
               Yes, on to the second page beginning with, 'Derrick.'
17
               'He saw Jerry on a porch at the house on Hood Street.
18
     Derrick leaving his girlfriend's house on Palisade Circle
19
     walking by the pool on Hood Street. When he walked by the
20
     house where Jerry sat" --
               You can stop there. Now, did you ever -- so,
21
2.2
     Palisade Circle, can you point to Palisade Circle. So, if
23
     Derrick was leaving his girlfriend's house and he was headed
24
     home, would he go on Hood Street?
```

MR. HAIGH: Objection. Calls for speculation, Your

1 Honor. 2 THE COURT: That's sustained. 3 BY MR. LAU: 4 Did you ever determine why it was that Derrick McRae 5 was on Hood Street that night? 6 No. 7 You can have a seat for a minute, Mr. Voorhees. Now, 8 let me direct your attention to Defendant's Exhibit 28, 9 Page 166, Line 3. And would you mind reading from Line 3 until 10 Line 12? 11 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this 12 point as improper impeachment. He has to ask the question 13 first before he can impeach this witness with his own 14 testimony. BY MR. LAU: 15 Do you recall the lighting conditions on that night 16 17 of the crime when you responded to the scene? 18 No, I don't. Α 19 Do you recall testifying in this case? 20 Vaquely. Α 21 And if you testified to the lighting conditions on 2.2 the night of the crime or the conditions on the night of the 23 crime, would that have been truthful? 24 Yes, it would. 25 Can I direct you to Page 166, Line 3, and ask you to

read from Line 3 to Line 12?

2.2

A Okay. 'Now, when you arrived, Captain Voorhees, at Mr. Davis' house, would you describe the street light that was present surrounding Mr. Davis' home? Answer: There was, as in every street in Rockingham, there is available street lights, however, as we described, the house is elevated from the street level and plus there's a lot of trees and growth around the house and in the area. So, there is street lighting where you could probably see to navigate without artificial light, but you wouldn't be able to see much.'

- Q Mr. Rankin was on the porch of the house on Hood Street, is that right?
 - A Yes.
- Q From what you can recall, did you ever determine how Derrick would know he was on the porch at that house on Hood Street?
 - A I have no direct knowledge.
- Q And if Derrick was walking by on Hood Street, based on your testimony, it would be difficult to see much, is that right?
 - A I would have to speculate.
 - Q But you did testify you wouldn't be able to see much?
- 23 A I testified at the time of my arrival, that's what 24 you could say.
 - Q Okay. At the time of your arrival, based on the

conditions that you observed, would somebody be able to see the 1 victim sitting on the porch from Hood Street? 2 3 MR. HAIGH: Objection. 4 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain it as to form of 5 question. 6 BY MR. LAU: 7 From your recollection, at the time you arrived, 8 would it have been possible to see an individual on the porch from Hood Street? 10 I think I already testified that I don't have any 11 recollection of me arriving. 12 Mr. Voorhees, I'm handed you what's been marked 13 Defendant's Exhibit 29, which I submit to you is a copy from 14 the clerk of court of a criminal infraction for Darius 15 Lockhart. And do you recognize that seal at the bottom of that 16 copy? Can you say what that is? 17 Α The lower right-hand? 18 Yes, the seal. Q 19 That's the seal of the Richmond County Clerk's Α 20 Office. 21 And you understand that to mean that this is an 2.2 accurate copy of their records? 23 Α I do. 24 And is there a date of birth for Mr. Lockhart here? Date of birth listed on this form is 9-8-1980. 25

But the time he was questioned in February 1996, he 1 2 would have been 15 years of age? If the date of birth on this form is correct. 3 Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been labeled 4 5 Defendant's Exhibit 8, which I submit to you is a statement 6 from Marlin Dumas taken by the Rockingham Police Department. 7 Now, is this statement similar to the statement that you would 8 have reviewed, wrote, or discussed with your colleagues with regards to the investigation of the death of Jerry Rankin? 9 10 Yes, it appears to be, but the name does not strike 11 any memory in me whatsoever. You would have reviewed this before submitting your 12 13 felony report, is that right? 14 If it was within the work product that I had in my 15 possession at the time, yes, sir, I would have. 16 Let me once again refer you back to Defendant's 17 Exhibit 24, and I'm looking at Page 5 of Defendant's Exhibit 18 24. Can you find Page 5 of Defendant's Exhibit 24? 19 Yes. Α 20 And at the top of Page 5, is there a witness name 2.1 listed there? 2.2 Α Yes. 23 And what witness name is that? Q 24 Marlin Maurice Dumas. Α 25 Does this indicate that it would have been within

your work product? 1 2 Yes. 3 Can I refer you to Page 1, second line up from the 4 bottom beginning with, 'After.' 5 What exhibit are we looking at? 6 We're looking at Defendant's Exhibit 8. I apologize. 7 Okay. And again, Page 1 --8 The front page of the statement, second line up, beginning with 'After they were,' and can you read from that 9 10 sentence and I'll let you know when you can stop, how's that? 11 Beginning with 'After they were.' 12 I don't see the statement here. 1.3 Do you have Defendant's Exhibit 8 in front of you? Q 14 I do. Α Second line from the bottom? 15 16 I was looking at the top. I thought you said at the 17 top. 'After they looked at me for a while, Thurman and Derrick 18 turned and walked up the hill and stood in front of the club 19 that is beside the pool. Derrick and Thurman stood in front of 20 the club for about 20 minutes, and I just stood behind a tree 21 and watched them because I wanted to see what they were going

Q You can stop there if you don't mind. Did you ever take Marlin Dumas out -- or do you recall anyone from Rockingham PD taking Marlin Dumas to the scene and asking him

2.2

23

24

25

to do with the guns.'

where it was that he was at?

2.2

A I said when you handed me this, I don't remember the name Marlin Dumas. It strikes no particular memory in me.

Q Okay. Now, the previous statement of Darius Lockhart marked Defendant's Exhibit 5, does it at any point -- and you can look at it if you have it there in front of you -- does it at any point reference Thurman Nelson?

A No, it does not.

Q Based on your -- generally, based on your experience as an investigator, would you have tried to determine where Dumans was standing?

A That would have been within the scope of reasonable investigative activity, yes.

Q If I can bring you to Defendant's Exhibit 8, the statement of Marlin Dumas, if I can ask you on Page 2 -- and it may be best if I just point out where I'd like you to begin reading -- beginning where it says, 'I saw --

A 'I saw fire come from the gun when it went off.

About four or five seconds a second shot was fired. The first shot came from the gun Derrick had in his hand because it was fired from on the porch of the house, and the second one fired was from Thurman and he was standing on the ground below the porch.'

Q You can stop there. Do you recall if there was one or two shots fired based on your investigation when you arrived

```
at the scene?
 1
 2
               I don't recall.
               And you processed the scene, is that right?
 3
 4
               No, sir. I requested another agency come and process
 5
     the scene.
 6
               You were at the scene?
 7
               I was at the scene.
 8
               Is Defendant's Exhibit 26 there with you?
 9
     handing you Defendant's Exhibit 26. May I direct you to Page
10
     69 of this exhibit?
11
          Α
               Okay.
12
               And do you recognize what Page 69 is?
13
               Yes. It's an inventory report form.
          Α
14
               How many shell casings were located at the scene?
          Q
15
          Α
               One.
16
               And how many projectiles were located in the victim?
          Q
17
          Α
               One.
18
               Mr. Dumas told investigators that two shots were
          Q
19
     fired?
20
               That's what that statement I just read was, yes.
21
               If you could locate in front of you Defendant's
2.2
     Exhibit 24, which is the felony report that you prepared.
                                                                  Now,
23
     you previously testified that you had the work product of
24
     Marlin Dumas with you when you did this, is that correct?
25
          Α
               Yes.
```

Q Will you turn to Page 2 under Detailed Statement Of Investigating Officer. Would you read that statement in its entirety?

A 'According to witnesses, Jerry Rankin, victim, came to JFK Drive where defendant was. The defendant sold Jerry Rankin some crack cocaine. Jerry reportedly sped off, when the defendant looked at the money Jerry had gave him, it was fake. Defendant and codefendant, Nelson, were looking for Jerry. Defendant had a .380 pistol and the codefendant had a small black pistol. According to eyewitnesses, two defendants found Jerry Rankin sitting on the porch of the house by the pool on Hood Street. Derrick McRae went up to the porch where the victim was, they argued, a few minutes after, the gun was fired. Both defendants ran off.'

- O Does that discuss a second shot?
- 16 A No.

2.2

- Q The eyewitness said that a second shot was fired, is that right?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Do you know why it was written out of this, second shot? Do you know why it's not included?

A It's a summary. Obviously, it contained -- along with the summary are all the statements. They're not inconsistent therein or conflict each other. Anybody that had this felony report would also have all the statements for the

victim. It's not like something was being hid or not stated 1 2 that wasn't truth. 3 Well, a second shot is inconsistent with the physical 4 evidence collected at the scene, is that right? 5 No, sir. 6 Was there any indication at the scene that a second 7 shell casing was there? A second projectile? Anything in the 8 house? 9 No, sir. The second gun could've been a revolver 10 that did eject a shell casing, and it was an open wooded area 11 outside. The chance of finding another slug is astronomical. 12 He fired from the ground at the porch, according to 13 the eyewitness, the second shot? 14 Yes. Α 15 The ground in front of the porch. He missed the 16 house is your testimony? 17 I don't know what position -- I mean, there is a 18 whole other 180 degree field that he could've been standing in 19 that the bullet would not have hit the house. I mean, this 20 isn't CSI. 21 The second one was fired from Thurman who was 2.2 standing on the ground below the porch. So, that could be 23 anywhere below the porch, is that what you're saying? 24 Yes. Α

25

Okay.

Q

```
I don't know that it happened. I don't know that it
 1
 2
     didn't happen. I'm just saying it's not inconsistent with the
 3
     physical evidence.
 4
               I'm handing you what I've marked Defendant's Exhibit
 5
     29, and if I can ask you, do you recognize Defendant's Exhibit
 6
     29?
 7
               MR. HAIGH: Excuse me, I believe that there is
 8
          already a 29 in evidence.
               MR. LAU: This will be 30.
 9
10
     BY MR. LAU:
11
               Now, can you read the second paragraph, beginning
     with, 'Derrick McRae.'
12
13
               Do you want me to tell you what it is first.
14
               Sorry. Yes, there was a question pending. Can you
     tell me what this is?
15
16
               It appears to be a synopsis with the RPD case number
17
     on it, suspects charged - Derrick McRae and Thurman Nelson, and
18
     what the charge is of first-degree murder.
19
               Now, is this a synopsis that would have been made in
20
     connection with your criminal investigation of Mr. Rankin's
2.1
     death?
2.2
               Yeah. I don't know who prepared it though.
23
               You recognize this is a record of the Rockingham
24
     Police Department?
25
               It's a computer-generated on a dot matrix printer.
```

Honestly, I don't know if this was prepared in the Rockingham Police Department or in the DA's office. I don't have that knowledge.

Q Let me direct you once again to Defendant's Exhibit 26, Page 15. Now, is this a copy of the synopsis that's included in the Rockingham Police Department's master case file which yesterday you testified to Defendant's Exhibit 26 was a bare reflection of it?

A Yes.

1.3

2.2

Q Now, can I ask you to begin reading at Paragraph 2, beginning with, 'Derrick McRae and Thurman Nelson.' Can you read that paragraph in its entirety?

Jerrick McRae and Thurman Nelson went looking for

Jerry Rankin. Witness, Marlin Dumas, saw Derrick McRae and

Thurman Nelson walking through the ball field on Hood Street.

Dumas saw a white male on the steps of the house behind the

Boys Club on Hood Street by the pool. Dumas said he knew the

house was Fishman's house. The house was the residence of Alan

Davis who is also known as Fishman. Dumas went on to say that

he saw Derrick and Thurman go up to the porch where Jerry

Rankin was sitting. Derrick went up on the porch and Thurman

stayed in the yard. Dumas said he heard Jerry and Derrick

arguing and said that he saw a flash of fire from a gun that

Derrick was holding and heard a shot. Then Derrick McRae and

Thurman Nelson ran off. Dumas said that he did not come

forward earlier because Derrick had threatened him.'

- Q You can stop there. Once again, there is no mention of a second shot here, is there?
 - A That's correct.

1.3

2.1

2.2

- Q Would it be important to have the second shot mentioned in the case summary?
 - A I do not know who prepared this, sir.
- Q Based on your personal experience as an investigator for the Rockingham Police Department, would it be, in your view, important to include that two shots were fired according to the eyewitness in your case synopsis as well as your felony report?

MR. HAIGH: Objection. Calls for opinion.

THE COURT: I'm going to let him offer his opinion, if you have one, about whether that would be proper procedure or routine procedure that you would expect.

A I would expect all the information to be made available to the district attorney, and if all the statements were included in discovery to the district attorney, and subsequently, made available to him and all the information was there. If there was a conscious effort to keep something from him, that would be unusual. I do not see that here. There are conflicting witness statements as you've pointed out yourself. Mr. Dumas obviously says something different than Mr. Lockhart does so — in a synopsis, which is a brief of what occurred, it

would not be unusual for it not to contain all the details of 1 2 each and every thing that every witness says. 3 Let me refer you back to the front page of 4 Defendant's Exhibit 8, which is the statement of Marlin Dumas. 5 Does the statement of Marlin Dumas include his age? 6 It does. 7 And how old was Mr. Dumas at the time? Fifteen. 8 9 And do you recall why Mr. Dumas was at the police 10 department? 11 I do not. 12 If a parent was present, would it be the practice of 13 the Rockingham Police Department at the time to include that in 14 his statement? 15 Yeah, if he was in custody. 16 Well, even if he was out of custody, would a parent 17 be permitted to be in the room and perhaps listed as someone 18 present when he's giving this account to law enforcement? 19 If he requested his parent, yes, it would be. 20 Was it the practice to ask a 15-year-old whether or 21 not they would like their parent present? 2.2 Α If they were in custody and being questioned about a 23 crime that they were the target of, yes, it was. 24 Was Mr. Dumas investigated himself as a possible

suspect in this crime? Do you have a recollection?

```
I don't know.
 1
 2
               Mr. Voorhees, you said the investigation continued,
 3
     is that correct?
 4
               Yes.
 5
               Handing you what's been labeled Defendant's Exhibit
 6
          Are you familiar with a criminal driver's response?
 7
          Α
               Yes.
 8
               Is this something commonly used by law enforcement?
 9
               Yes.
10
               If I may turn you to Page 4, at the very bottom,
          Q
11
     Criminal History. Can you begin with cycle one and read --
12
     well, as cycle one, does it list the charge there?
1.3
          Α
               Yes.
14
               What's that charge?
          Q
15
          Α
               Murder.
               Does it list an event date?
16
          Q
17
          Α
               Yes.
18
               And what's that date?
          Q
19
               August 15, 2006.
          Α
20
               Now, does Mr. Dumas' statement indicate when he gave
21
     his statement to law enforcement? Is there a date on it?
22
          Α
               February 26, 1996.
23
               MR. LAU: If I can have a moment, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Yes.
25
    BY MR. LAU:
```

Q Let me back up and have you refer to Page 3, and at the top of Page 3, on the right-hand side, it lists the conviction under the column that says Status. Do you see that there?

A Give me just a second to become familiar with this.

This is an out-of-state -- I'm not familiar with all their codes. If you give me just a moment to review it.

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object to this exhibit at this time. There's no indication that the witness is familiar with how it's produced, where it came from, or who produced it, and that it's in the same shape as an accurate representation of what the records reflect in the original system.

THE COURT: What's your position with respect to the authenticity of this.

MR. LAU: Your Honor, this was produced by the State. I mean, if the State -- if we need to call a witness from the State, we're happy to do so. If the State is unwilling to stipulate that this is a true and accurate copy of their own file in this case.

THE COURT: So, this is something from what file?

MR. LAU: This is in the State's response to our

motion for appropriate relief, an addendum that they

included.

THE COURT: Do you have any reason not to rely on it?

1.3

2.2

Any reason for me not to rely on it? 1 2 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, doing prosecutions for a 3 decade, I would say that often times the information in 4 these is accurate. 5 THE COURT: Right. 6 MR. HAIGH: So, I would say that, absent more 7 information, this doesn't really prove anything without 8 having a witness who operates the system. I mean Your 9 Honor has been around long enough to know that these have 10 other people's convictions on them sometimes and other issues. 11 12 MR. LAU: Is it my understanding that the State is 13 doubting the authenticity of its own record. 14 MR. HAIGH: Yeah, we don't produce stuff. 15 another entity that does. 16 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection having 17 been raised is the authenticity of it. I will give you an 18 opportunity to validate this or authenticate it. 19 MR. LAU: Your Honor, may we approach. 20 THE COURT: Yes. 2.1 (Bench conference was held with both counsel 2.2 present.) 23 BY MR. LAU: 24 Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you a copy of what's been 25 marked as Defendant's Exhibit 32, which is a sentencing order

from the Circuit Court of the City of Norfolk, Virginia related to Marlin Dumas. Can you find on Page 1, a list of the charges against Mr. Dumas? Yes. And can you read those charges to me? Capital murder, robbery, robbery, abduction, abduction, malicious wounding, and appears that he stands with the following petitions of charging conspiracy, two counts of conspiracy. Now, what was the petition date according to this record from the Circuit Court of the City of Norfolk? It says at the top, the hearing date was July 9, 1997. The petition date was July 31, 1996. And Marlin Dumas gave his statement on February 26, Q 1996? That would be five months prior, yes. Now, when the investigation continued, do you have any recollection of learning that the eyewitness in this case was charged with capital murder himself? Again, at that point, I wasn't the trial officer. wasn't the officer assigned to go to trial with it, no. answer no, I have no recollection. Now, based on your experience as a law enforcement investigator, would it be important to know that the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

eyewitness, the only person who placed himself at the scene,

was himself charged with capital murder?

2.1

2.2

A Yes. I would hope that as soon as our department found out about it, we notified the District Attorney's Office. I would hope that would be how it happened. Or if the District Attorney's Office found out about it and notified us -- again, I don't know which way it occurred.

Q Turning to Page 2 of Defendant's Exhibit 32, beginning with where it says, 'The clerk sentences the juvenile,' can you read that paragraph below indicating the final disposition of the case for Marlin Dumas?

A 'Incarceration in the Virginia Department of Corrections for the term of life for capital murder, ten years each for robbery as charged in indictments two and three, five years each for abduction as charged in indictments four and five, and 20 years for malicious wounding as charged in indictment six. The total sentences imposed is life plus 50 years.'

Q And what is the date that Mr. Dumas was sentenced in this case? Do you see a signature from the judge along with the date?

- A July 18, 1997.
- Q Do you recall the date of Mr. McRae's trial?
- 23 A I do not.
- MR. HAIGH: The State will stipulate that it was May 11, 1996.

MR. LAU: 1998. 1 2 MR. HAIGH: I'm sorry, 1998. 3 MR. LAU: Thank you, State. 4 Your Honor, I don't know if you're inclined to take a 5 break at this point, but I'm about to move on to another line 6 of questions. 7 THE COURT: I'm always inclined to take a break. 8 Let's go a little bit further. It's just not quite 11 9 yet. 10 BY MR. LAU: 11 Mr. Voorhees, I'm going to hand you what's been 12 marked Defendant's Exhibit 7, which I submit to you is the 13 statement of Serena Parker. Now, does this statement of Ms. 14 Parker -- as you testified before, you would have been present 15 for the statement, discussed this statement with the individual 16 who took the statement, or have written that statement 17 yourself? 18 I did not write it myself. This is not my 19 handwriting, but I more than likely would have discussed it 20 with Detective McNeil. 21 And referring back to Defendant's Exhibit 24, which 2.2 is the felony report in your handwriting with respect to 23 Derrick McRae, at Page 4, under Witnesses, do you see Ms. 24 Parker's name there? 25 Α I do.

Q So, this was work product that you had possession of when preparing the felony report?

A Yes.

1.3

2.2

Q Does Ms. Parker indicate a time -- well, can you read the first sentence of Ms. Parker's statement for the Court?

A 'on October 14, 1995, at about 10:50 p.m, I was in my apartment located at 912 Palisade Circle in Rockingham.'

Q Now, if I could, can you just read the whole report into the record. I would ask you to read beginning with, 'October 14, 1995, to its conclusion?

THE COURT: Take your time so she can take all this. Thank you.

A 'On October 14, 1995, at about 10:50 p.m. I was in my apartment located at 912 Palisade Circle in Rockingham.

About at this time, I heard some people talking outside my bedroom window. The lights were off in my apartment. I did not have curtains up to my window. So, when I looked out of the window to see, I saw Derrick McRae, Thurman Nelson, Jeremy Sturdevant, Johnny McRae, Julio Sturdevant talking. I know these guys from living in the neighborhood, and they used a table in my backyard to play cards on. A few minutes later this white guy named Jerry Rankin walked up to Derrick McRae and asked him for a rock. When Derrick gave Jerry the rock, Jerry gave Derrick some money he had folded up in his hand. I know Jerry Rankin because he used to hang out with my dad.

They were using my back porch light so they could see.

2.2

After Jerry Rankin gave Derrick the money, Jerry walked away going towards JFK Drive through the apartments. A few minutes later, Derrick unfolded the money that Jerry had gave him and said, "Naw, that motherfucker cheated me. Nobody cheats me." Jeremy said, "Let's go and blast -- I can't see that word because of the numbers typed on the bottom of the page -- motherfucker" and Derrick said, "Yes, let's go kill him." Then Julio said, "No man, let it go" to Derrick.

Derrick, "No. I'm going to blast him." Julio said to Derrick, "Well, do what you got to do." At about 11:15 p.m, Derrick, Jeremy and Thurman ran down towards JFK Drive the same way that Jerry had gone.

At or about 11:30 p.m, I heard one gunshot. About ten minutes later, I saw Derrick, Jeremy, and Thurman running back up towards my house. When they got in my yard, they stopped and bent over resting their arms on their knees.

Jeremy was the first one I saw coming towards my apartment.

They then disappeared somewhere behind my apartment. Later that night, I heard what sounded like someone knocking over my trash cans, but I was afraid to go outside to see what the problem was. The next morning, I figured I would get up real early so I could see what was in my trash can before anyone could see me.

So, I got up about 6 a.m the next morning, and when I

looked in my can, the only thing that was in there was an object wrapped up heavily in plastic. I left it in there to go get my dad, and when I returned it was gone. A little later that morning, I was getting ready to go out my front door when Derrick, Thurman and Jeremy were on the porch of my neighbors. Karina, who lives at 910 JFK Circle --

Q Can you reread that 910.

1.3

2.2

Palisade Circle, I heard and saw them through my front door which I had cracked open. I heard Johnny ask Derrick, "Did you get rid of the gun?" Derrick told Johnny that he gave it to Thurman to throw in the river. I then came out my front door and Derrick said, "Yeah, bitch, I know you know what happened, and if you tell I'll kill your ass." About three days later, I was at my mother's house on JFK Drive when Derrick got into an argument with my mother about what I saw. Derrick said, "I'll kill y'all ass just like I did that white boy Jerry." He then told me that the night doesn't have eyes. A few days later Derrick began cutting the screws on my windows and he set a fire on my front porch. I decided to come forward because I'm tired of Derrick and his boys going around scaring people.

Signed Serena Parker, witnessed by Detective GW McNeil.'

Q Now, in your experience as an investigator, when witnesses give a statement, can you describe the importance of corroborating the statements? Do you have an opinion as to

whether it's important to corroborate statements? 1 2 It is. 3 Do you recall anyone speaking to Julio Sturdevant in 4 this case? 5 I don't recall. 6 Do you know Julio? 7 Α Yes. You're familiar with him? 8 0 9 Α Yes, sir. 10 Now, if you had spoken with him, to corroborate this 11 statement, would that be information that would be included in 12 the felony report sent over to the District Attorney's Office? 1.3 MR. HAIGH: Objection. Speculation, Your Honor. THE COURT: I'll let you answer if you know whether 14 that would be included. 15 16 If it existed prior to the felony report being 17 generated, if it was -- if the statement was taken after such 18 time the felony report was taken, it would have been just 19 forwarded to the DA's office at such time that it was 20 available. 21 BY MR. LAU: 2.2 So, is it the practice that the continuing 23 investigation of the Rockingham Police Department after the 24 felony report was forwarded to the DA's office as the 25 information became known?

A Usually, what would occur is right before the indictment and grand jury, one entire package would be delivered to the DA's office with however many copies they requested for discovery and anything subsequent to that that came up in the investigation, yes, it was turned over to the DA's office as soon as it became available.

Q Did you speak to -- or do you recall yourself or anybody from the Rockingham Police Department speaking to Serena Parker's mother?

A I don't recall.

2.2

Q Anyone going out to Serena Parker's house to see if there's any evidence of screens being cut or fires being set on the porch?

A I don't recall.

Q But you did speak with her dad, is that correct? Do you remember? Do you know who Serena Parker's dad is?

A I'm assuming he's a Parker. I vaguely remember an individual, but I can't remember his full name.

Q Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been labeled Defendant's Exhibit 6, which I submit to you is the statement of Larry Parker.

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you know Larry Parker to be Serena Parker's dad?

A It seems so, yes, sir. After my memory is being refreshed and the address being the same, yes. She refers to

her father in her statement.

1.3

2.2

Q Refers to her father in the statement. Now, if you don't mind, can you look at Defendant's Exhibit 6 and ask if anybody recorded Mr. Parker's recollection of going to a trash can because his daughter -- to determine what was inside?

A His statement does not say anything about the trash can.

- Q Is there a date on Mr. Parker's statement?
- A 2-27-1996.
- Q And how about Ms. Parker's statement?
- 11 A 2-27-1996.

Q Based on your experience as an investigator, would it have been important to corroborate from Ms. Parker's father for account of attempting to see what was in the trashcan?

A If he was still available to the investigator at the time. If he spoke to Ms. Parker before he spoke to Mr. Parker, yes, that would obviously be something he'd ask during the interview. I don't know in which order they were interviewed. I don't know if Mr. Parker made himself available again after his initial interview. There was obviously some issue about they feared for their lives. I don't know the conditions under which they agreed to talk.

If the stars lined up correctly for the investigator, and they were perfectly willing to speak and speak openly and candidly without reservations, and the officer had full access

```
to them, yes, that would be something that would be important
 1
 2
     to ask, but if he didn't have full access, it's possible he
 3
     couldn't have asked it.
 4
               Do you recall why they were at the police department
 5
     that day?
 6
               No, I do not.
 7
               Now, if I can direct you to the last paragraph of Ms.
 8
     Parker's statement on Page 30, which was Defendant's Exhibit 7.
     Can you read that last paragraph?
10
               'I decided to come forward because I'm tired of
     Derrick and his boys going around scaring people.'
11
12
               Now, does Ms. Parker's statement, going back to
13
     Defendant's Exhibit 8, which is the statement of Mr. Dumas, is
14
     Ms. Parker's statement consistent with the statement given by
     Mr. Dumas?
15
16
               MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor, calls for
17
          conclusion.
               THE COURT: I'll let you offer your opinion as to
18
19
          whether it's consistent or not.
20
               There are both -- I would say there's inconsistencies
21
     and consistencies between the two statements.
2.2
     BY MR. LAU:
23
               Can I ask you to turn to the last page in Mr. Dumas'
24
     statement. Can I ask you to read the last paragraph about
25
    Mr. Dumas' statement?
```

'The only reason I came to you tonight and told you 1 2 about this is because it has been bothering me and I could not 3 get it off my mind.' Both these witnesses gave altruistic reasons for 5 coming forward, is that right? 6 Yes, sir. 7 Do you recall -- have any reason to doubt the 8 veracity of these witnesses? I don't recall. 9 10 Do you recall doing anything to reconcile the 11 inconsistencies among the two statements? 12 I don't recall my direct actions, no, sir. 1.3 Do you know of the Rockingham PD making any effort to reconcile the inconsistencies in these two statements? 14 15 As far as something I could sit here and testify Α 16 today that they actually did, no, sir. I have no knowledge. 17 And would those efforts be forwarded to the District 18 Attorney's Office if they were made and the inconsistencies could be reconciled? 19 20 They could have been forwarded or they could have 21 been made in conjunction during the trial preparation. 2.2 Q So, the District Attorney's Office would have known 23 what it was -- what actions took place to reconcile? I would hope so. 24

Are you familiar with Thurman Nelson's testimony in

this case?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- I know he testified.
- Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 17, which I submit to you is a copy of Mr. Nelson's testimony at Mr. McRae's second trial. And if you would, could you turn to Page 75 of Mr. Nelson's testimony, beginning at Page 10, I'm sorry, beginning at Line 10 and going to Line 25. Could you read that for me?
- Yes. 'Did you go inside the house where Derrick McRae lived on JFK Drive? Yes. Between 10:30 and 11:00 on October 13, 1995. The same night you saw Jerry Rankin spinning tires? Uh-huh. You went into the house where Derrick McRae was staying? Uh-huh. And you went in with Antoine Rush? Uh-huh. Did you see Derrick McRae? Uh-huh. What was he doing? He was asleep.
- Now, Ms. Parker told the Rockingham Police Department at 10:50 Derrick, Julio, Thurman, Jeremy, and Johnny McRae were in her backyard. Do you have an opinion as to whether that's consistent with the statement the witness said at trial?
 - MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor. He's asked to comment on the sworn testimony of another witness.
- THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that.
- 23 BY MR. LAU:
- Did Thurman Nelson tell you, or do you have any 25 recollection of Mr. Nelson telling you or anyone at the

Rockingham Police Department that Mr. McRae was asleep during 1 2 the period in which Ms. Parker says they were together? 3 I have no recollection of ever speaking with 4 Mr. Thurman. 5 Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been identified 6 as Defendant's Exhibit 33 which I submit to you is a statement 7 of Thurman Nelson. Can you tell me who it was that witnessed 8 the statement on Page 2? 9 Captain RL McQuay and Detective GW McNeil. 10 So, this is a record of the Rockingham Police 11 Department's investigation? A record of their interview with him. 12 1.3 And if you don't mind, can you read the statement 14 into the record? 15 Α Okay. 16 THE WITNESS: Before we start, Your Honor, this last 17 line of the statement is not photocopied in whole. I will not 18 be able to --19 THE COURT: All right. Just read what you can read. 20 'I Thurman Nelson, give this statement to Captain RL 21 McQuay of the Rockingham Police Department of my own free will. 2.2 On 10-14-95, around 7:30 or 8 p.m, I was with Derrick McRae on 23 JFK Drive in Rockingham. A guy by the name of Jerry Rankin 24 pulled up in a small red truck. He made a buy of crack cocaine

from Derrick. When Jerry handed the money to Derrick for the

crack, he took off spinning the rear tires. After Jerry left, Derrick looked at the money Jerry had given him and he realized it was not money, but a piece of paper folded up. Derrick told me that he would get that dude Jerry for giving him this fake shit. I hung around for a while with Derrick and then I left JFK with some friends and we walked up to East Boston Street. Later that night, I went back to JFK Drive and I got up with Derrick McRae. Derrick told me that he got that guy back who gave him the fake money. I told Derrick that I -- it trails off (unreadable) -- Derrick told me that he shot the guy Jerry Rankin, and I heard some other people talking about a guy who was shot in the head on Hood Street. Derrick didn't tell me what he shot Jerry with, but Derrick had kept a .380 handgun with him most of all times. I didn't see Derrick with the .380 handgun at any time after Derrick told me he shot Jerry. Signed Thurman Nelson.'

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q Referring you back to Defendant's Exhibit Number 7, the statement of Serena Parker. Having read these two statements today, and in your experience as an investigator, do you have an opinion as to whether they are consistent?

A They describe the same incident from their point of view.

Q Well, what time does Ms. Parker describe an incident occurring?

A She says about 10:50 p.m when she first starts her

1 statement. 2 And what time does Thurman Nelson describe the 3 incident occurring? 4 He starts his recollection around 7:30, 8:00 earlier, 5 and then he describes going back at some point to get back up 6 with Derrick and it doesn't specify a time. So, it's sometime 7 between then and when he got back up with him. And does Mr. Nelson indicate that he and 8 9 Mr. Sturdevant went with Derrick to get Mr. Rankin later that 10 day? 11 Mr. Nelson doesn't mention Mr. Sturdevant. 12 And in your experience as an investigator, according 13 to Mr. Nelson's statement, Derrick was given fake paper for 14 drugs between 7:30 and 8 p.m that night, is that correct? 15 Α Yes. 16 And according to Ms. Parker's statement, sometime 17 after 10:50 p.m., Derrick McRae was once again given fake paper 18 from Mr. Rankin for drugs? 19 I don't believe it was once again. I believe that 20 they are describing the same incident. 2.1 Where did Ms. Parker say that the incident occurred? 2.2 Α Behind her apartment. 23 Where was her apartment located? Q 24 912 Palisades Circle. Α 25 Would you mind getting up and showing us on the map Q

were Palisades Circle is located? 1 2 (Witness complies.) 3 Where does Mr. Nelson, if you don't mind referring 4 back to Mr. Nelson's statement, Defendant's Exhibit 33, where 5 does Mr. Nelson say that this apparent transaction occurred? 6 JFK Drive. 7 And can you point on the map where JFK Drive is? 8 (Witness complies.) 9 Now, those are separate streets, are they not? Q 10 Yes, but it's possible for one to be the backyard of Α 11 another. 12 Tell me about that? 1.3 Well, this is Palisade Circle and if Ms. Williams was 14 to live in any of these -- I mean, Ms. Parker was to live in 15 any of these apartments, the back of her apartment, which is an 16 open field and a basketball court, would face John F. Kennedy 17 Drive. 18 According to Thurman Nelson's statement, where was Q 19 Mr. Rankin when this transaction occurred? 20 Said he pulled up in a small red truck. Α 21 Q So, he was in the street; is that right? 2.2 Α That's an assumption to make from the statement, yes. 23 Drove his truck up onto the backyard? Q 24 No. I wouldn't make that assumption. Α 25 Well, these statements indicate two different times Q

```
and two different places, is that right?
 1
 2
               Yes.
 3
               Yet you believe they are the same transaction?
 4
               Yeah.
 5
               And you didn't talk to Julio Sturdevant?
 6
               No.
 7
               You don't recall speaking, you or anyone from
 8
     Rockingham Police Department, speaking to Julio Sturdevant?
 9
               I do not.
10
               MR. HAIGH:
                           I'm going to object to the leading nature
11
          of the questions at this time, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: I'll overrule that.
13
     BY MR. LAU:
               You don't recall?
14
15
          Α
               No.
16
               And according to the top of Page 2 of Ms. Parker's
17
     statement, Julio said, "No, man, let it go."
18
               She said Julio said that.
19
               Would it have been important, in your experience as
20
     an investigator, to talk to Julio Sturdevant?
21
               Yes. If he was at all available to law enforcement,
2.2
     he should be talked to.
23
               Do you recall at any time during the course of the
24
     Rockingham Police Department's investigation in this case --
25
     including your own personal investigation of this case or any
```

officers of the RPD -- identifying a red truck that Mr. Rankin 1 2 may have been driving that night? 3 I had personal knowledge that his father drove a 4 small Mazda red truck. 5 Based on that personal knowledge, was it your 6 assumption that it was his father's red truck? 7 Α Yes. So, to you, it would be your opinion that that would 8 corroborate the statement of Mr. Nelson? 9 10 It would be one indicator that it would be correct. 11 Did you speak with Ms. Rankin or Mr. Rankin, the 12 parents of the deceased? 1.3 I did not. 14 Did somebody from the RPD speak with the parents of 15 the deceased? 16 I have no direct knowledge if they did or not. I assume they did. They were present at trial. 17 18 I'm going to hand you what I've marked Defendant's 19 Exhibit 34, which I submit to you as the testimony of the Ms. 20 Jackie Rankin at the second trial of Mr. McRae's case. If vou 21 would, turn to Page 178 and if you could begin on Line 14. 2.2 would appreciate your reading for the Court Line 14 to Line 23. 23 'Now, did your -- when was the last time that your 24 son, Jerry Rankin, came to your house prior to his death?

Approximately two weeks. Did you lend your red pickup truck

that evening to your son? No, sir, he did not have permission 1 2 to drive any of our vehicles. He had permission to drive none 3 of your vehicles? None of our vehicles.' 4 You can stop there. During the course of the 5 investigation, had officers talked to Ms. Rankin, would they 6 have wrote down that her son, the deceased, did not have the 7 red truck on that night? MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor, misrepresentation 8 9 of testimony. 10 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that. 11 BY MR. LAU: 12 Would it have been important, based on your 13 understanding of Mr. Nelson's statement, to speak with the 14 parents of the deceased, Mr. Rankin, to determine whether or 15 not he had access to the red truck that they owned? 16 Yes. 17 And if he had access to the truck, would that be 18 noted by yourself or another member of the RPD in its case file? 19 20 It should be noted by whoever made the contact. 21 And that would then be forwarded to the District 2.2 Attorney's Office? 23 Α Yes. 24 Going back to that testimony, if you don't mind going 25 up a little further on Page 178 of Ms. Rankin's trial testimony marked Defendant's Exhibit 34, on Line 5, can you read from Line 5 to Line 17?

A 'Ms. Rankin, when did you last see the red pickup truck before you went to see your son at Sister Odessa's on October 13, 1995? I don't recall if it was from the yard or not. My husband was working in the building behind our house. Sometimes he would pull it around there if he was working on a TV. He would load a TV up on the truck and pull around. I do not remember seeing it in the yard. I don't remember.'

- Q And if you could keep reading to Line 17?
- A 'Now, did your -- when was the last time your son,

 Jerry Rankin, came to your house prior to his death?

 Approximately two weeks ago.'
- Q Would it be important, during the course of the investigation and your experience as an law enforcement officer, to know the recent movements of Mr. Rankin if he's supposed to be in a red truck earlier that evening?
 - A Yes.

1.3

2.1

2.2

- Q Would it have been important that he had not been to his parent's home in the previous two weeks where that red truck was located?
 - A Yes.
- Q And it would have been documented by the officer who spoke with Ms. Rankin that he hadn't been there for two weeks?
 - A Should have been.

Q If we could go back to Defendant's Exhibit 6, which is the statement of Larry Parker, and if we can go to more than midway through -- I can approach and point out -- beginning at, 'A few minutes later.' Can you read the remainder of that paragraph?

2.2

A 'A few minutes later, the black male left, walking up the sidewalk.'

Q Can we back up? Does it say the black male?

A 'A few minutes later the six black males left walking up the sidewalk that goes in front of my house. They were headed towards Palisade Circle. After they left, Jerry asked me what time it was and I told him it was 10:34 p.m. He told me that he was afraid of those guys and that he was going to his brother's house who lives near the skating rink on Rockingham Road. At about 10:45 p.m, I heard a gunshot coming from Palisade area. About two or three minutes after the gunshot, I saw the same six black males running from the pool area real hard. The only three I recognize that was running was Derrick, Tony, and Jeremy.

I heard someone say pick up the damn gun, and the black male that was wearing a blue jacket picked up the gun and they all ran behind the apartment towards Rockingham Road. I decided to come forward because Jerry was a friend of mine and the person that killed him should be caught.'

Q Going back to Defendant's Exhibit 7, which is the

statement of Serena Parker, do you have an opinion as to 1 2 whether the statement of Ms. Parker and the statement of 3 Mr. Parker are consistent? 4 They describe the same incident. 5 They describe the same incident? 6 From their point of view. 7 Now, if you could stand up, go to the map again if 8 you wouldn't mind. Are you familiar with the location of the skating rink on Rockingham Road? 9 10 It's not on the map. I'll be glad to stand up. 11 Can you stand up and point to where that location 12 would be? 13 It would be further up this way on Rockingham Road. 14 (Indicating) 15 That way. Okay. Now, according to Mr. Parker's 16 statement, he lived at 910 JFK Road. Can you point to 17 approximately where 910 JFK Road is for the Court? 18 It would be in this area. (Indicating) 19 And he says that six black males went headed towards 20 Palisade Circle. In which direction from JFK Road would that 2.1 be headed? 2.2 You can see this footpath back here behind the tree 23 line and whatnot. It would probably be in that general 24 direction towards Palisade. The pool they're talking about is

25

right here.

```
And Jerry Rankin was headed toward the skating rink.
 1
 2
     And which direction would he have been going?
 3
          Α
               That way. (Indicating)
 4
               Okay. And where was the victim killed at?
 5
               This row of houses right here, one of those.
 6
               You can have a seat. Now, just a short time after
 7
     Mr. Parker describes him heading in the opposite direction of
 8
     where the victim's body was found. He reports hearing a
     gunshot from the Palisades pool area. Did you try and
10
     determine, during the course of your investigation, how
11
     Mr. Rankin or why Mr. Rankin would change course from going to
12
     the skating rink and be shot a short time later? Do you recall
13
     trying to figure out why he was shot a short time later in the
14
     opposite direction?
15
                           I'm going to object at this time, Your
               MR. HAIGH:
16
                  That's a misrepresentation of the statement.
17
          says in the statement that he was going in that direction,
18
          but nobody here can establish where he actually went.
19
                           I'm going to sustain that, and with that,
               THE COURT:
20
          we're going to go ahead and take a break. We'll be in
2.1
          recess for about 15 minutes.
2.2
                    (Court in recess for morning break.)
23
               THE COURT: All right. You may continue.
24
     BY MR. LAU:
25
               Mr. Voorhees, I believe where we left off we were
```

```
looking at Defendant's Exhibit 6, which was the statement of
 1
 2
     Larry Parker. Now, did you ever try to -- or do you recall or
 3
     do the record or any member of the Rockingham Police Department
     try to reinterview Mr. and Mrs. Parker to determine whether or
 5
     not this was indeed the same incident?
 6
               I can only testify to my actions, and no, I did not.
 7
     I have no recollection.
               Now, Ms. Parker said three individuals left
 8
 9
     Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Parker said it was six individuals who came
10
     running back and left, is that correct?
11
               MR. HAIGH: Objection. Compound question, Your
12
          Honor.
1.3
               THE COURT:
                           I'm going to sustain that. I didn't
14
          understand what the question was. You said one person
15
          said one thing, and one said another, is that correct?
16
          Are you asking if each of those statements were correct.
               MR. LAU: I'll rephrase my question.
17
18
               THE COURT: Okay.
19
     BY MR. LAU:
20
               Now, Ms. Parker said that three individuals left
21
     after Mr. Rankin, is that right?
2.2
          Α
               Yes.
23
               And Mr. Parker said six individuals came running back
24
     after leaving, is that right?
25
          Α
               That's correct.
```

And Ms. Parker said her and her dad went to the trash 1 can the next day, correct? 2 3 Correct. 4 And Mr. Parker said Jerry Rankin showed up at his 5 house to sell some stuff according to his statement. Can you 6 see that at the beginning of Mr. Parker's statement? 7 Α We didn't read that into the record, but, yes, I see 8 Well, why don't we now, if you don't mind. 9 10 don't mind reading from the beginning of the statement, 11 Defendant's Exhibit 6, beginning at "I, Larry Parker.' 12 'I, Larry Parker, was in my house asleep on October 1.3 14, 1995, at about 10:15 p.m. Jerry Rankin came to my house 14 which is located at 910 JFK Drive. When I went to the door to 15 see what he wanted, he had some stuff he wanted to sell me for 16 \$25. I've been knowing Jerry for a while because he used to 17 hang out every now and then. I gave Jerry \$25 for his stuff. 18 So while he and I were on the front porch talking, the six 19 black males came down the sidewalk towards my home.' 20 You can stop there. Ms. Parker talked about Jerry 21 Rankin coming intent to sell some goods to Mr. Parker. 2.2 No. She does not say that. 23 And you didn't reinterview them to determine what in 24 fact, or if, in fact -- you don't recall reinterviewing them or

any member of the Rockingham PD reinterviewing them, do you?

1 I personally did not, and have no knowledge whether 2 anyone else did. 3 MR. LAU: May I approach. 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 BY MR. LAU: Mr. Voorhees, I've handed you what's marked as 6 7 Defendant's Exhibit 4, which is the statement of Corey Robinson 8 given to Detective JC Brickman. Now, would you have reviewed this statement, wrote the statement, or been aware of the 10 contents of this statement through your conversations with the 11 other detectives in this case prior to completing the felony 12 report? 1.3 Yes, at some point I would have. Α 14 And does this statement have a date on it? 15 Yes. Α 16 And what's that date? Q 17 Α March 1, 1996. 18 Would you read that statement to the Court? 19 'I, Corey Spencer Robinson, give this statement to 20 Detective JC Brickman of the Rockingham Police Department of my 21 own free will. Near the end of the month of November, I was on 2.2 Palisade Circle. A man named Julio told me that he had found a 23 gun. Julio told me that he had the gun belonging to Derrick 24 McRae and Thurmond Nelson and that he wanted \$300 for it. 25 gave Julio \$150 and told him I would give him the rest later.

Julio gave me the gun and I left. The gun was a silver in 1 2 color .357 Magnum Police Ruger with brown handles.' 3 Do you recall yourself, or any member of the Rockingham Police Department, making any efforts to secure the 4 5 qun from Corey Robinson? 6 I don't recall myself doing it, and I have no knowledge to the other actions. 7 Would -- in your opinion and experience, would it be 8 important if you have a witness telling you that they have a 9 10 gun that connects back to the suspect in a crime to attempt to 11 obtain that weapon? 12 Yes. 1.3 Now .357 Magnum or Mag Police Ruger was not the same 14 caliber as the projectile found at the scene, is that right? 15 A casing was found at the scene, and no, that doesn't Α 16 match. 17 And in your experience, would that matter whether or 18 not you pursue a gun from a witness saying they have a gun 19 connected back to a suspect? 20 No, it wouldn't because you have inconsistent 21 statements about another suspect and another gun and it goes 2.2 back, when I told you before, there could have been a revolver 23 on the scene. This describes a revolver. A revolver does not

So, your opinion is that an investigation that was a

eject a casing -- very well could have been there.

24

thorough investigation would have sought out this gun from 1 2 Mr. Robinson? 3 It would have been good investigative techniques, 4 practices, best practices. 5 Is there -- if that was done, an attempt to secure 6 the gun from Corey Robinson was made, would that be something 7 that would have been reported on? 8 Yes. Included in the case file? 9 10 Yes. 11 Is there anything in the case file communicating 12 Mr. Robinson's gun was sought by the Rockingham Police 13 Department? 14 I don't know what was in -- as it sits today, these 15 paper works that you've handed me, I have not seen anything. 16 Was it ever in there, I don't know. Was it ever done, I don't 17 have any personal knowledge. Maybe introduced in trial as a 18 piece of evidence. Was it handed over to the original defense, 19 I don't know any of those questions. 20 Do you know why Corey Robinson was at the police 21 department on March 1, 1996? 2.2 I do not. 23 If individuals are being interviewed by the 24 Rockingham Police Department, is there any policy with respect

to documenting that interview? Was it required that

documentation take place?

A Yes.

2.1

2.2

Q And when individuals were interviewed, are they asked, as a regular course of practice, if they're willing to give a witness statement?

A Yes.

Q And they would either handwrite it themselves, or the investigator would write it for them?

A Yes. The person conducting the interview -- could have been a field interview, could have been a noncustodial interview, could be a voluntary interview, they could have just wrote a substance of oral statement out and documented the interview and not gotten it signed, all those things could've happened.

Q And would that have been the practice irrespective of what the witness told the detective?

A It was the policy of the Rockingham Police

Department, if someone was admitting to a crime, to make every effort to get it in their own handwriting if possible, if not, in the officer's handwriting and get them to sign it.

Q What about a witness providing information?

A Again, best case scenario to have it in their own handwriting. At the very least, get them to sign it, if they will sign it. If not, the officer is to document it and sign it themselves.

And what about information that was potentially 1 2 favorable to the defendant? Was that also included? 3 It was irrelevant. If it was information given to 4 us, it was treated all the same. Obviously, you can see we 5 have several statements that contradict each other, and we 6 certainly didn't weed any of those out because they didn't 7 contradict the --8 I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's 9 Exhibit 35. Do you recognize Defendant's Exhibit 35 as a form 10 used by the Rockingham Police Department? 11 Α At that time, yes. 12 Can you describe this form? 13 It was the Rockingham Police Department Statement of 14 Rights Form read to anybody who was under advisement of their 15 Miranda rights. 16 What was the standard to advise them of their Miranda 17 rights? 18 They were in custody and they were suspected of a 19 crime. 20 Mr. Sturdevant was in custody and suspected of a 21 Would his statement, while in custody and suspected of crime. 2.2 a crime, be something that would ordinarily be wrote down or 23 put into a report? 24 He gave one.

And if he didn't give one, would something document

that he didn't provide a statement? Would there be a notation 1 2. made? 3 A notation, officer could simply say he didn't make 4 one. Sometimes they note it on the form itself. I don't see 5 any indication of that on this form. 6 It's not necessarily that --7 It could be a simple notation somewhere. 8 Let me hand you what's been marked Defendant's 9 Exhibit 19. Do you recognize this exhibit? 10 I can tell what it is. 11 Okay. And what is it? 12 It's a statement that was given on March 26,1996, by 13 Edward Lewis Tender. Said he requested to speak to Detective 14 JC Brickman and Detective Sergeant Voorhees without his lawyer 15 present. 16 Were you present for this statement by Mr. Tender? 17 I didn't sign it, but the officer that wrote it 18 mentioned me, so I'm assuming I was. 19 Now, would you mind reading this statement for the 20 Court? 21 'On this the 26th day of March 1996, I, Edward Lewis Tender, request to speak with Detective JC Brickman and 2.2 23 Detective Sergeant Voorhees without my lawyer present. About

two weeks ago, Derrick McRae, who is in jail for murder, came

to me and told me he wanted to talk to me. Derrick McRae told

24

me that he walked up on a white boy, Jerry Rankin, while he was on a porch sleeping. Derrick McRae said that when he walked up on the porch, he put a .380 handgun to Jerry Rankin's head and shot him. Derrick McRae said that he then took the .380 handgun and hid it in some bushes near the house where he shot Jerry Rankin.

Derrick McRae said that about two days later, him and two other boys, that I can't remember their names, went back and got the .380 handgun and took it and hid it in Chapel Town near his -- Derrick McRae's house. Derrick McRae -- the copy fades off -- the reason he shot Jerry Rankin was because he was a white boy. Derrick McRae also said that all white people need to die. Yesterday on 3-35-96, Derrick McRae came to me and said that he was going to kill some of the police. Derrick McRae said that he was going to start with Phil Sweat, Detective Brickman, Captain McQuay, and he was going to work his way down. Signed Edward Lewis Tender, 3-26-1996. Witnessed Detective JC Brickman.'

Q Now, as an investigator, have you ever employed the practice of sending an individual back to get more information after a statement has been obtained when they allege that somebody's told them something?

- A No. We don't use them as our agent.
- Q So, you wouldn't have used Mr. Tender as your agent?
- 25 A No.

2.2

You would, however, seek to corroborate what 1 2 Mr. Tender had told you, is that right? 3 Α Yes. 4 Did you speak with anybody else in the jail, to your 5 recollection, or did anybody else from the Rockingham Police 6 Department speak with anyone else from the jail trying to 7 determine whether or not Mr. McRae had spoken with Mr. Tender 8 or anyone else? 9 I don't know. 10 And this motive is different -- well, is the motive 11 identified here that he shot Mr. Rankin because he was a white 12 man or a white boy? 13 That's what he said. 14 Now, in your opinion, is that consistent with the 15 motive offered by others? 16 It's not consistent with what's in other witness statements. 17 18 And do you recall, personally, or any other member of 19 the Rockingham PD discussing with you attempts to corroborate 20 whether or not Mr. McRae was motivated by racial prejudice? 2.1 I don't recall. 2.2 Q And if those attempts were made, they would be 23 something that would be documented in the file, is that right? 24 Α That's correct. 25 And that's not in the file in front of you, is that Q

correct? 1 2 What's that? 3 Well, this is from 3-26-1996, and your earlier 4 testimony was that there's nothing in the file subsequent to 3-1-96, is that right? 5 6 That's correct. 7 So, any efforts to corroborate any information in 8 Mr. Tender's statement is not in the file? 9 There is nothing in the file that you handed me as it 10 sits today dated past 3-1-96. 11 And you don't recall what efforts were made, if any? Whether there was anything in this file after 3-1-96, 12 13 prior to it being handed me today, I do not know. 14 Can you recall any investigative efforts that took 15 place after that date? 16 I don't recall being present for this interview. 17 have no memory. 18 Now, if efforts were made to reconcile the 19 inconsistencies, that you mentioned yourself in the statements, 20 those records -- those efforts would have been documented, is 21 that right? 2.2 If there was anything, yes. Any statements, any 23 witnesses that said anything, any physical evidence that was 24 collected, anything that could have been documented should have 25 been documented, yes.

And sent to the District Attorney's Office? 1 2 Yes. 3 MR. LAU: That would complete my questions, Your 4 Honor. 5 THE COURT: Cross examination. 6 CROSS EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. HAIGH: Now, have you -- I'm sorry, how long have you been in 8 law enforcement? 9 10 I started in 1990, and I resigned in 2003 -- 2002. 11 And I know it's 13 years, you never had two witness 12 statements be identical, have you? 13 It's rare. It's very rare. 14 And normally there are inconsistencies, isn't that 15 right? 16 Absolutely correct. 17 And if they are exact, wouldn't that cause suspicion 18 on the statements? 19 Yes. Α 20 So, in fact, it lends to credibility in your mind 21 that there are inconsistencies, isn't that right? 2.2 It's consistent that they are inconsistent with the 23 behavior I normally see from witnesses and suspects when you 24 take statements from them. 25 And just because there is some inconsistencies, that

wouldn't make you question the veracity in and of itself, would 1 2 it? 3 Α No. And the statements that you talked about here, they 4 5 all point to the defendant as the shooter, don't they? 6 Yes. 7 So, on the ultimate issue they are consistent, isn't 8 that right? 9 To the main point, yes. 10 And I want to talk about times a little bit. Q 11 it fair to say that when you're looking at witness statements 12 to a particular crime, the times almost never end up being an 13 exact or consistent? 14 What's also important to note is many of these 15 statements, as they were written down, were taken months after 16 the original incident. I think the original incident occurred 17 in October of '95, and many of these statements weren't put to 18 paper till February and March of the following year. 19 Okay. And let's talk about that. Can you look at 20 Defendant's Exhibit 6? 21 Yes, sir. Α 2.2 All right. Now, where does it say that Mr. Parker's 23 located? The second line of the second paragraph there? 24 Doesn't that say 910 John F. Kennedy Drive? 25 Α Yes, it does.

So, let's take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 7, second line of second paragraph. 'I was in my apartment located at 912 Palisade Circle, 'isn't that right? That's correct. So, she and her dad actually aren't even in the same place, isn't that right? 910 and 912 would be adjoining apartments or right beside each other in adjoining buildings. So, they're not looking at the events from the same angle or same place, isn't that right? That would be correct. Α Now, I want to talk to you a little bit about what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 23. That's the binder I think. I'm sorry, it's Defendant's Exhibit 25. As this file came to you today, was it organized? No. Can you elaborate on that. How can you tell that it's disorganized? Well, if it would have been my original work product, everything -- Number 1 would have been in the binder. wouldn't have been separated out in folders like this and wouldn't be loose where something could fall out of it, you

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

know, and obviously, as I've noted before, things that -- at

least time was taken to create a tab for is not there. It's

been my experience in the past, when I have been in court and

had the original file with me, defense or the prosecution would ask for an original document out of the file. You would hand it to them, they would mark it as an exhibit, put it right into evidence right then and that may explain why some of it is missing. Again, I probably haven't laid eyes on this binder since '98, '99. Like I said, the police department was remodeled. We moved twice during the process. Things were sent to a warehouse, you know.

So, as you sit here today, do you have any personal recollection of what that binder looked like back when it was prepared?

It's a vague memory, and it's really based off of how I would do all of them. It's more of a course of conduct; how I would normally put them together.

- So, you have no specific memory of this particular 0 binder?
- I do not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Is it fair to say that your testimony thus far has Q been speculation as to what was and what was not in that binder at that time?
 - Yes. I hope that's included. Α
- Q Do you still have Defendant's Exhibit 23 in front of 23 you?
- 24 I do. Α
- 25 Can you please draw your attention to Page 4 and onto Q

1 Page 5? 2 Oh, 23. I apologize. I do not see an exhibit marked 23. 3 4 Just for the record, what are you looking at there? 5 A felony report from the Rockingham Police Department 6 for defendant Thurmond Nelson and codefendant Derrick McRae. 7 Q Can you please draw your attention to Pages 4 and 5? 8 Okay. 9 And what are listed on those pages? 10 At the top of the page, the victim information is 11 listed and further -- halfway down continuing is witnesses 12 identified at that time. 1.3 So, the witness is listed in that report. Would that 14 list all of the witnesses that you were able to identify and 15 get statements from? 16 To that point in time. Up until, I think, the report 17 is dated March 1, 1996. 18 So, it's fair to say that's the extent of the 19 witnesses if there was no subsequent ones identified later 20 before trial? 2.1 Correct. And those were also provided to the State 2.2 23 Prosecutor's Office, is that right? 24 That's correct. 25 Now, you were asked on direct about revisiting with

Isn't it fair to say that particularly in a murder 1 2 investigation in somebody's neighborhood, they're going to be 3 reluctant to speak to the police? 4 Yes. And have you run into situations where you got 5 6 initial statements from somebody and were unable to have them 7 cooperate -- to later go back and corroborate issues? 8 Yes. 9 Now, do you recall specifically whether that happened 10 in this case or not? 11 I don't recall. Obviously, based on the statements 12 I've read today, at some point it was an issue. 1.3 Fair to say it's par for the course for things like 14 that to happen? 15 Yes. Α 16 Now, the area that we're talking about for the crime, 17 how prevalent was the -- based upon your information to law 18 enforcement, how prevalent was the sale of crack cocaine in 19 that area that we're talking about in 1996? 20 It was just a short time later we actually had that 21 entire area designated a federal weed and seed high crime area 2.2 and targeted for specialized law enforcement efforts. 23 So, it's fair to say that it was a high drug area, is 24 that right?

Yes, absolutely it was.

25

Α

All right. And when you're dealing with the case, high drug area, is it fair to say that your witnesses are not going to be angels, is that right? That's correct. And additionally, they may be more reluctant to speak to law enforcement for that reason, isn't that correct? Α That's one reason, yes. And earlier you testified about Ms. Rankins' testimony and the use of a red truck that Mr. Rankin allegedly didn't have permission to use that truck. Isn't it fair to say 11 that a person can use a truck without having permission? 12 I believe if you look at the victim's criminal 13 history, it wouldn't be the first time that he took the truck 14 without permission. Now, you testified that based upon the statement of 16 Mr. Tender, that's exhibit --Nineteen, maybe. 17 Α Yes, 19. So, you were present for that interview, is 19 that correct? I would have to say so based on the interview, but I 21 don't recall it. I have no memory of it. Q And you didn't make any offers to Mr. Tender in 23 exchange for his statement, did you? Certainly don't have any memory of that. No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

18

20

2.2

24

25

And in fact, you wouldn't have authority to do that

anyway, would you? 1 2 I would not. 3 Okay. And you don't recall any other law enforcement officers making offers to Mr. Tender in exchange for his 4 5 statement, do you? 6 I do not. 7 And in fact, the case that you were dealing with, Mr. 8 McRae's case, is a Rockingham case, isn't that right? That's correct. 9 10 And the cases that Mr. Tender were held on were Q 11 Richmond County cases, isn't that right? 12 Best of my recollection, yes. 1.3 And you wouldn't be able to do anything with regards to another law enforcement entities' cases, would you? 14 15 I would have no authority to do so. Α 16 MR. HAIGH: No further questions from the State, Your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: Any redirect. 19 MR. LAU: Just a few questions, Your Honor. 20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. LAU: 2.2 Mr. Voorhees, if I can direct your attention to 23 Defendant's Exhibit 5, if you still have it up there? 24 I have it. 25 What's the date of that statement?

2-21-96. 1 2 And Defendant's Exhibit 8, the statement of Marlin What's the date of that statement? 3 4 2-26-96. 5 Exhibit 6, the statement of Larry Parker. Do you 6 have that with you? 7 2-27-96. Α 8 Exhibit 7, the statement of Serena Parker. Do you 9 have that with you? 10 2-27-96. 11 Exhibit 4, the statement of Corey Robinson? 12 March 1, 1996. 13 I don't believe you have Exhibit Number 9 with you, 14 but let me get Exhibit Number 9. This is what I submit to you 15 is the statement of one Michael Anthony Ferguson. And what's 16 the date on Mr. Ferguson's statement? 17 March 1, 1996. 18 And I'm going to hand you what's been marked 19 Defendant's Exhibit 10 and 11, which I submit to you are the 20 statements of Paul Montes William and Tonya Clark. Can you 21 tell me what the date of those statements are? 2.2 Α Tonya Clark is 2-28-96, and it would appear 2-27-9623 on Paul Montes Williams. 24 Thank you. And do you still have Defendant's Exhibit 25 33 in front of you?

I do. 1 Α 2 And what's the date on Defendant's Exhibit 33? 3 Α March 1, 1996. 4 Now, all those statements come within a very short 5 period of time, is that correct? 6 Yes. 7 And how long is that length of time? Over a period of from the 26th to the first -- well, 8 9 the 21st. Over a period of about two weeks. 10 Now, you testified for the State that these witnesses 11 typically are afraid to come forward, is that right? Or that 12 they may be afraid to talk to police because of their 1.3 neighborhood? 14 Generally, I testified to that. I didn't testify to 15 these witnesses in particular. 16 Okay. Is it common for all of your witnesses in a 17 case to come forward in such a short period of time, four and a 18 half months after an investigation begins? 19 It's not uncommon once a piece of evidence presents 20 itself or one particular witness presents itself with a list of 21 other names for people to follow up with for you to immediately 2.2 seek those people out and talk to them. No, that's not 23 uncommon. 24 So, they didn't come to you is what you're saying,

that you would often go to them?

It depends. I don't recall it in this case. 1 2 Sometimes they would come forward; sometimes you would have to seek them out. 3 The statement of Larry Parker, Exhibit 6; statement 5 of Serena Parker, Exhibit 7; and the statement of Marlin Dumas, 6 Exhibit 8, do you still have those statements with you? 7 Α I do. 8 With respect to Exhibit 8, the last paragraph on 9 Exhibit 8, Mr. Dumas' altruistic reason for coming forward, is 10 that accurate? 11 Mr. Dumas said the reason he came forward tonight was 12 to tell you about it because it has been bothering him and he 1.3 could not get it off his mind. And Defendant's Exhibit 6, this is the statement of 14 15 Larry Parker, and the last paragraph can you read -- well, that 16 once again is an altruistic purpose for coming forward, is that 17 right? 18 He offers the reason for giving the statement, yes. 19 And what is that reason? 20 Jerry was his friend and the person that killed him 21 should be caught. 2.2 And Ms. Serena Parker, the last paragraph of her 23 statement, that offers an altruistic reason as well? 24 She also offers a reason. She was tired of the boys

in her neighborhood going around scaring people.

Do witnesses typically, if you went out and found 1 2 them, offer altruistic reasons why they came forward? 3 It's a matter of routine for an investigator to 4 ask. 5 Would you ask? 6 Yes. 7 And then when you went back to talk to them, if they 8 wouldn't speak, would you ask them again? 9 We would ask them if anything's been changed, if 10 they've been contacted, threatened or anything changed while 11 they were willing to --12 Now, you said these witnesses are typically -- had 1.3 some reluctance coming forward or especially may show 14 reluctance on being revisited by police. Isn't it also true, 15 in your case, that witnesses tend to lie about their own 16 conduct and minimize the conduct of their own? 17 Yes. I've been lied to many times in my life. 18 Now, when you testified to the binder which is 19 marked, I believe, Defendant's Exhibit 25, you're not 20 speculating about what should have been in the binder, right? 2.1 Α No. 2.2 Q And do you still have Defendant's Exhibit 28 up 23 there, which is your testimony from the second trial? 24 Yes. Α

And can you turn to Page 165, beginning on Line 19?

25

Q

'Captain Voorhees, would you answer my question. 1 2 question is did you investigate this case as far as any 3 suspects outside the City of Rockingham? Yes.' 4 You can stop there. So, the investigation of those 5 suspects, based on your knowledge prior to being removed, 6 should have been in that binder? 7 I'm not going to answer that because that makes the 8 assumption that something's there and been removed and that's a loaded question. 9 10 Would you have documented the investigation of those 11 suspects? 12 Α Yes. 1.3 And that documentation would have ended up in that 14 binder, correct? 15 If any existed, yes, sir. Α 16 MR. LAU: I have nothing further, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Further questions? 18 MR. HAIGH: Nothing for the State, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 20 We'll go ahead and take our lunch break All right. 2.1 and resume at 2:00. 2.2 (Court in recess for lunch break) 23 THE COURT: Further evidence for the defendant. 24 MR. LAU: Your Honor, before calling our next witness, we would move to introduce at this time 25

1 Defendant's Exhibits 21 through 35. 2 MR. HAIGH: If I may have a moment, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Sure. 4 MR. LAU: And I apologize, we would like to introduce 5 21 through 24 and 26 through 35, and we are not going to 6 be introducing the master case file from the Rockingham 7 Police Department. MR. HAIGH: No objection, Your Honor. 8 (Defense Exhibits 21 - 24 and 26 - 35 were 9 10 admitted.) All right. Again, for the record, I'm 11 THE COURT: 12 going to allow the police department to retain that 1.3 exhibit not having been introduced as evidence, but I've 14 instructed the custodian not to in any way alter or allow 15 anyone else to have access to the file, understanding it 16 will be in the evidence locker and will be locked in the 17 evidence locker with the Rockingham Police Department, is 18 that correct? 19 THE WITNESS: In the safe. 20 In the safe, I'm sorry, and it's to be THE COURT: 2.1 brought out only upon the order of the Court. Yes, sir. 2.2 MR. COLEMAN: We're going to call our next witness, 23 Michael Parker. The witness, Michael Parker, was sworn and 24 25 testified as follows to the examination of

1 counsel. 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. COLEMAN: 4 Good afternoon, Mr. Parker, how are you? 5 Fine. Thank you. 6 Would you state your full name, where you live, the 7 city in which you live, and where you work. 8 My name is Michael Parker, I live in Carriage, North 9 Carolina. Right now, I'm employed with the Fayetteville --10 City of Fayetteville as a police attorney. 11 Q And what is your title in that position? 12 Police Attorney for the City of Fayetteville. 1.3 Prior to your current job, where were you employed? 14 I was employed in Scotland in Hope County as a Α 15 homicide prosecutor. 16 And roughly what period were you employed? 17 January 1, 2011 until July 1st of 2014. 18 July 2014 is when you left that position and became 19 police attorney? 20 No. 2.1 No? 2.2 I retired on July the 1st, and I did not take the job 23 with Fayetteville until September the 29th. 24 Prior to January 2011, where were you employed? 25 I was the elected district attorney for Richmond,

Anson, and Stanley counties. 1 2 And that includes Rockingham? 3 That's Richmond County. 4 0 How long were you the elected district attorney? 5 Six years. 6 Six years as the elected district attorney and prior 7 to that? 8 I was the chief assistant district attorney. 9 So, can you give me the time period during which you 10 were the elected district attorney? 11 November the 1st 2004 till December the 31st 2010. 12 Q 2010? 1.3 Yes, sir. Α 14 And you were the chief assistant during what period? Q 15 From around August of '96 to -- I was appointed Α 16 district attorney in 2004. 17 In November of 2004? 18 Α Yes, sir. 19 And prior to August 1996, how were you employed? Q 20 I was an assistant district attorney. Α 21 In which district? Q 2.2 Α Richmond, Anson, Stanley, Union, and Moore Counties. 23 So, basically, the same district only a little more Q 24 expanded? 25 There was five counties, then they split off Moore

County on January the 1st, I think, of '97, and then they took off Union County in 2006, I think.

1.3

2.2

Q Can you briefly describe what your responsibilities were beginning in 1995 until you became the chief assistant district attorney?

A I would have been -- I was the prosecutor who worked individual counties. I trained new assistants. I was in charge of county -- I worked in Stanley County and then I was transferred from Stanley to Richmond County, and I was responsible for the case loads in those counties.

Q And you say you were responsible for the case loads, what do you mean?

A Well, I had the responsibility of prosecuting the cases pending in those counties along with whatever other prosecutor was assigned --

Q I think I interrupted you. So, when you say that you prosecuted individual cases during this period --

A I did. I handled cases.

Q And did you prosecute particular kinds of cases or just generally felonies?

A The way our office was set up at that time, you were subject to be -- I was assigned a particular county. I would be known as the county head at that time, but then another prosecutor, usually younger, was put there with you to work those cases and we were subject to -- we were responsible for

all the cases in Superior Court. We were also subject to being put in District Court as needed. So, you could be prosecuting a capital murder case this week and be due in juvenile court Monday, depending on what was needed in the office at the time.

1.3

2.2

We did not have specific case assignments. They were not introduced at that time for regular felonies. We would work the individual cases up. We would talk to the lawyers or whatever, and then when they were ready to be tried, we would identify a trial list and then we would divide them up among the prosecutors who were working to try the cases.

Q And when you say, 'we,' you mean you and the assistant who worked with you?

A As an ADA, what I typically do is -- well, I have a system. My system was whenever I had a term in Superior Court coming up, I would look at the cases and see which ones were the oldest and identify what defendants were in the jail the longest and then those would become my top priority cases for that term of court, so that if you had somebody that had a case that was 18 months old and they're the longest in jail, that become your first case for trial.

We didn't have a trial list like they do -- we didn't have the dockets divided. We had one trial docket. And they were called trial dockets. They would have as many as 200 to 300 cases on them. Prosecutors were responsible for every case on there if you were assigned to that court. Every one of

those cases was subject to being called for trial if you didn't reach a plea agreement in the case.

1.3

2.2

What we would typically do, as the prosecutor in charge of the county, is we would identify the cases that were -- should be tried that week or that we were ready to go for and then we would sit down with the other assistants there and we would divide them up and say well, I'll take John Smith, you take Jane Doe and back and forth. That's how we set the trial order for that week.

Q Beginning in October of 1995, until you were promoted to chief assistant in August 1996, where were you working, which County?

A I'm pretty sure I was in Richmond County then, but I know that I tried -- I'd been sent to -- I know I was in Moore County from 1990 to around '94. My mother died while I was there, so that's how I remember that. They let me stay three years which is unusual. Normally, prosecutors didn't stay in a county more than six to eight months. They like to switch us around. But I know I stayed for three years, and I left there and went to Stanley County, and I had to try a big murder case up there, and when that case was done -- and I cannot remember when that case was tried. I tried to find it, and I haven't been able to find the dates on it, but when that was done I was moved to Richmond County. So, it would have been somewhere around '95, I'm thinking, is when I came down here.

During that period beginning October '95 through 1 2 August '96, were you county head in Richmond County? 3 Α Yes. 4 You were. And how many other prosecutors were there 5 in the county? 6 I know that there was always one other one. At some 7 point in time, I believe I was able to get a second one 8 assigned down here, but we really only had two offices and we were falling all over each other trying to do the case load 10 down here. So I know it was me and there might have been at 11 least one and maybe two. 12 And so during the period when there were two of you, 13 the two of you were responsible for all of the cases in the 14 county? 15 Α The three of us. 16 The three of you? Q 17 For all the cases in Superior Court. 18 You did that until August '96, then you became chief Q 19 assistant? 20 Yes, sir. 21 And as chief assistant, what were your 2.2 responsibilities? 23 My responsibilities then were -- well, they evolved 24 over time, but at that time, I was put in charge of all the 25 murder cases and the cases in Richmond County. I also did

training prosecutors -- in-house training for our office. I scheduled and assigned murder cases to prosecutors to try because we had been doing a different system and it was not working. So, we changed and developed a new system for handling the murders. And I did not at that time -- I can't remember when it progressed. I eventually got to the point where I was assigning prosecutors to handle court during the court assignments across the district, but I don't remember -- I know that I didn't get that right off the bat, I think it came a year or so later.

2.1

2.2

- Q During the period that you were the chief assistant, did you handle individual cases? That is, were you the prosecutor in any of the cases?
- Q When I was first promoted to that, I was still the head of Richmond County, plus taking on that responsibility. I worked individual cases in Richmond as well as tried to supervise across the district and that didn't work well.
- Q So, let me ask you to turn your attention to October of 1995, when you were an assistant in Richmond County. Do you recall a murder case that developed during that period in which Derrick McRae and Thurmond Nelson were codefendants?
- A I remember that case because you came and talked to me about it. I cannot tell you if I became aware of it in October of '95. During that time -- many times, law enforcement didn't contact us about their cases. We would find

out about the murders when we walked into district court and got the calendar and it had the murder probable cause set on there. That was one of the things that we changed over time so that we became more involved earlier. So, I know the case you're talking about because we spoke about it. I cannot say that I knew about it in October of '95. I may have; I don't know.

2.2

Q Actually, what I meant was during the period of October '95 through the time when you became chief assistant, you at some point during that period, you became aware of the case?

A I don't know if I did. I probably did, but I can't swear to that. I don't know.

Q Can you briefly describe how a case came to the -- came to your office following the police department investigation. A typical murder case?

A The law enforcement would -- they'd have a call, they would go out and investigate the case, they would then bring whatever charges they chose to. Sometimes, if it was a particularly difficult case, they would come and talk to the higher ups probably in the office, and they would charge. But the regular rank and file prosecutors, we would find out about that case when we walked in and found the probable cause hearing for the murder in District Court.

At the time, we used to do probable cause hearings a

lot on those cases, and if you were assigned to court, you tried to do the probable cause hearing if your stuff was in order or ready. Only when it came through District Court or when it was indicted did we actually become aware of it and start working that case in Superior Court.

Q So, beginning with the indictment in the case, your office then would have been substantially involved?

A Yes. That's when it shows up on a Superior Court calendar, and that's when the prosecutors who work in Superior Court in that county became aware of it and started doing what they -- well, should have started doing what they were doing, whatever they did with them.

Q Can you describe what's delivered to your office by the police department when the case arrives. What accompanies the case to your office?

A They were supposed to bring us copies of everything in their police files.

- Q Copies of everything in their police file?
- A Right.

1.3

2.2

- Q And what would you do with whatever it was, the file that they brought you, to preserve it? Did you do anything to preserve it?
- A Typically, I can tell you what I would do is you sit down with the officer -- we had a case summary form that we would write, and write down a shorthand summary of what

happened and maybe answer a few questions about the case, was 1 2 there a search, you know, has the defendant given a statement, 3 that type of thing. And we would take that file in or the 4 information the officer provided and it would go in a felony 5 file folder and it would be -- you would review the indictment 6 and then the indictment would be signed and go to the grand 7 jury. So, the way that that worked -- well, once you got it 8 in, you put it in that file. And then, at some point in time, 9 one of the prosecutors would come and start discovery on that 10 file. 11 Do you know if you received the original copy of 12 the --1.3 Somebody coughed over here. Can you start that over. Α 14 Do you know if you received the original copy, that Q 15 is the police department's original copy of that file or did 16 you receive a duplicate copy? 17 We shouldn't have received the original. It should 18 have been a photocopy.

- Q Should not have received the original?
- A They shouldn't give us the original.
- MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, may I approach the witness.
- THE COURT: Yes.
- 23 BY MR. COLEMAN::

19

20

2.1

2.2

24

25

Q Mr. Parker, I'm going to show you what has been marked for identification as Defendant's Exhibit 25. I'm going

to ask you to take a look at this. This is the original, or at 1 2 least, part of the original file of the Richmond -- I'm sorry, 3 the Rockingham Police Department. My question is whether you 4 received this copy or something different, if you recall? And 5 I'm talking now about the actual physical document that you're 6 holding? 7 Okay. I've looked at this. What is your question? 8 Is that the document that would be delivered to you? 9 That particular document, the original? 10 Α No. 11 And to your knowledge, have you seen that document 12 before? 1.3 I've not seen this. What typically would happen is 14 they would make a copy of this stuff at their office. 15 would bring over the copies to us. We would take the copies 16 in, fill out our case summary form, and put those in the file. 17 He may come with this. I can't say what this is. I don't 18 recall. 19 Do you know if the document, the copy that you 20 received, would have been tabbed in the way that this one is? 21 It would not have been tabbed. They wouldn't bring 2.2 me a notebook like that. 23 Q Okay. 24 MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to return this

and he can then --

Is he free to leave? 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. COLEMAN: He's free to leave. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Officer, you're 4 free to go. 5 BY MR. COLEMAN: 6 When you received the duplicate copy of the police 7 department's files, would you keep it together as a single document, or did you pull it apart? 8 9 Eventually, it would be pulled apart, but it should 10 have been kept in the felony file folder until the prosecutor 11 put it in notebooks. 12 Do you know, if during the trial, you would have 1.3 relied on the original Police Department file or would you have 14 relied on documents that were part of the duplicate files that 15 you received? 16 If you're asking about the McRae case, I don't have 17 any idea because I didn't try that. 18 I didn't say that? 19 If you're asking about general files with me, Okay. 20 I relied upon my files that I had been provided by law 21 enforcement. If I needed to introduce a document that was, 2.2 let's say a statement or rights waiver or something like that, 23 I would get the original from the officer who should have had 24 it in the courtroom. That's what I always wanted to introduce. 25 That way you avoided the best evidence rule or complaints about

```
duplicates and stuff like that.
 1
 2
               I'm going to ask you to -
 3
               MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, may I approach.
 4
               THE COURT:
                           Sure.
 5
     BY MR. COLEMAN:
 6
               Mr. Parker, in front of you are the exhibits that
 7
     have been marked in this proceeding, and what I would like you
 8
     to do is to take a look at Defendant's Exhibit 23 and 24.
               All these?
 9
10
               Yes. And if you would try to keep them in order.
11
     These are felony reports.
12
               Okay.
1.3
               This would be one of the documents or, in this case,
14
     two of the documents that you would receive, one for each
     defendant in a case with codefendants.
15
16
               It should have been provided, yes.
17
               Let me ask you on Exhibit 24 to look at the second
18
     page of the document.
19
          Α
               Okay.
20
               What is your understanding -- the purpose of the
21
     statement on Page 2 of Defendant's Exhibit 24?
2.2
          Α
               Well, it says -- the title of Page 2 on Defendant's
23
     24 says a Detailed Statement of Investigating Officer.
24
               And what does that mean to you?
25
               That would mean that that's where the officer
```

```
basically summarized his findings of the investigation in the
 1
 2
     case.
 3
               And so this Page 2 is a description of the result of
 4
     the investigation by the police department with respect to this
 5
     defendant?
 6
               That's the way I would take it. That's how you
 7
     asked.
 8
               And if you look at Defendant's Exhibit 23, you'll
 9
     notice that there is no Page 2, but my question is in the
10
     document that would have come to you, there would have been a
11
     page two, is that correct?
12
               I can't answer that. The document which you've
13
     handed me, Defendant's Exhibit 23, has page number two at the
14
     bottom of that first page.
15
               Forget about that page.
          0
16
               Okay. Well, that says Page 2.
17
          Q
               Yes.
18
               What you are asking about is the detailed statement.
          Α
19
               Correct.
          Q
20
          Α
               Okay.
21
               And there isn't one with this exhibit, but that
2.2
     detailed statement, that would have been in this exhibit, would
23
     have summarized the investigation with respect to Mr. Thurmond
24
     Nelson, is that correct?
```

That's what that purports to say, yes.

```
What I'd like to do now is -- are you familiar with a
 1
 2
     document that's called a Synopsis Of and then a case number?
 3
          Α
               Okay. If you can show it to me, I can tell you if
 4
     I'm familiar with it. That doesn't strike me off the top of my
 5
     head, no.
 6
          Q
               If you look at Defendant's 30.
 7
          Α
               Thirty?
 8
               Yes.
          0
 9
               Okay.
          Α
10
               You recognize this document?
          Q
11
          Α
               Not really, no.
12
          Q
               Are you familiar with this type of document?
13
               This is -- it's been so long since we've used these.
14
     I'm not really familiar with it. It appears to have been
15
     something that an officer would have created and provided in
16
     his file to us. That's what it looks like to me, but
17
     specifically I don't recall a lot about that document, no.
18
                           This document indicates that the subject
          Q
               All right.
19
     is a Derrick McRae and Thurmond Nelson, so based on past
20
     practice, when this document was generated, your understanding
21
     is that it would have been generated by the investigating
2.2
     officer summarizing the evidence with respect to these two
23
     defendants?
24
               MR. HAIGH: Objection. Leading, Your Honor.
25
               THE COURT:
                           I'm going to give him a little bit of
```

1 leeway and ask him if he can answer that yes or no and 2 certainly you may explain your answer, Mr. Parker. 3 I don't know that I understood the question. 4 THE COURT: All right. Even with the leading 5 question you didn't understand it. I'm going to give you 6 another shot at it. 7 BY MR. COLEMAN: So, what is a synopsis? You told me who prepares it, 8 9 and what I'm asking you now is, what is the purpose of this 10 document? 11 That's what I said. I don't know what the purpose of 12 this one is because to my recollection, our office -- the DA's 13 office, we didn't prepare something like this. So I have to 14 assume this was done by the law enforcement agency, and if 15 that's the case, then I assume that it is exactly what it says 16 which is a synopsis of what the officer says happened. 17 And synopsis means, again? 18 A summary of. Α 19 A summary of his investigation? 20 I don't know that. I just know it says Synopsis at the top, but I don't know what they would have used this for. 21 2.2 Q Okay. That's fair. Now, when you get to the point of seeking an indictment, on what do you rely? That is in 23 24 terms of the evidence on which you relied to bring charges

against the defendant? What's the basis for the facts?

I cannot -- well, usually it's the warrant. 1 2 prepare the indictment off the warrant. 3 And who prepares the warrant? 4 Either the officer or the magistrate when they go 5 down to get it. 6 And the warrant would set out what? 7 The date of offense, the name of the defendant, the 8 name of the victim, and the officer who -- the arresting officer. 9 10 And does it summarize the facts? 11 It's going to have -- well, you know what a warrant 12 says. It has a summary of each of the central elements of the 13 That's what's on a warrant. 14 Okay. If you would read Defendant's Exhibit 30. Q 15 read it to yourself. 16 Is that the one we were just looking at? 17 Q Yes. 18 Okay. Α 19 Does this summary, this synopsis -- is this 20 consistent with what your understanding of the facts were that 21 were developed by the Rockingham Police Department in this 2.2 case? 23 MR. HAIGH: I object, Your Honor. It assumes 24 knowledge that's not in evidence. 25 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain it as to the form of question, give you an opportunity to lay a foundation if you wish to further visit that.

BY MR. COLEMAN:

1.3

2.2

Q Can you tell me the basis on which you understood the factual basis for the -- let me start over, too many bases.

Can you tell me what was your understanding or how did you gain your understanding of what the facts were that implicated the defendants in the case in which you obtained an indictment?

A We would have -- typically, what you would have done is had the officer come over. We'd like to have the file before we actually issue the indictment, but on murder cases, because we were trying -- at this time, we were trying to speed up the disposition of them. We may have simply met with the officer and did a case summary sheet about what happened, and based upon that information, signed the indictment and put the officer's name on it to go before the grand jury with it.

Q Can you tell me what this case summary sheet is?

A It was a sheet in the DA's office that we used at the time, or we still used them whenever I left there, and it was what I mentioned to you before. It was a summary usually written by the prosecutor based on what he understood the evidence from the officer was. Then we would go through and — it had blocks on it where you could write down a list of physical evidence that was relevant, whether there was an admission or a statement from the defendant, whether there were

a search, what the basis of the search was, that type of thing. 1 2 It was a sheet designed to allow us to be able to take a plea 3 to that case in court with nothing but the information on that 4 one sheet. 5 In other words, if we had to summarize the facts 6 for the Court during a plea, that was the only sheet that we 7 needed. It was just a shorthand summary of what we understood -- how the case came about. 8 Where would that document be filed? 9 10 That was kept in the DA's file. Α 11 MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, may I approach. 12 THE COURT: Yes. 1.3 BY MR. COLEMAN: 14 Mr. Parker, do you recognize these two documents? 15 Can you identify them? 16 Yes. Defense Exhibit 36 is a murder indictment for 17 Thurmond Nelson case number 96 CRS 1675. Defense Exhibit 37 is 18 a murder indictment for Derrick McRae case number 96 CRS 1576. 19 These two documents list as witnesses RJ Voorhees and 20 RL McQuay, both documents. Who are those individuals? 21 RJ Voorhees was former chief of the Rockingham Police Department. I think at this time he was a detective. McQuay 2.2 23 was a detective with the Rockingham Police Department.

mean? What was their role in the indictment?

And by listing them as witnesses, what does that

24

A I don't know what their role was. I know that these names were typically the ones that came often with the warrant. When the warrants would come into our office, there was a legal assistant who took the warrants and typed indictments based on the warrants that she had. She would list the names of these officers on there. They would automatically be put on there, usually from the warrant. Now, if the prosecutor who signed them or took the case in knew that additional names would be on there, the only way that we could add them would be to tell her to add those names to the indictment list — I mean, to the witness list on the indictments. Typically, this is the investigating officers.

Q And the indictments then would be based upon the conclusions reached by the investigating officers? That is the factual conclusions that the investigating officers reached based on their investigation?

A The indictments were based on the facts in the case. The officers would go in, testify to what those facts were before the grand jury.

Q That was my question.

A Okay.

MR. COLEMAN: May I approach, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

24 BY MR. COLEMAN:

1.3

2.2

Q Mr. Parker, can you identify this document?

- A Yes. This is a witness list.
- 2 Q And what is a witness list?
- A It's a list of people who are potential witnesses in a case.
 - Q And do you know who developed this list?
 - A I know that I wrote this list, if that's your question.
 - Q That's my question.
 - A Okay.

1.3

2.2

Q What information did you use in order to prepare this list?

A I would have used the statements that were enclosed in the file. I would go through and read the statements of the witnesses. I would try to do it -- we had so many murders pending at the time, I was trying to develop a method to be able to -- like an assembly line to move the cases through. And what I tried to do was read the statements one time and take off information like you'll notice on it, it has the name of the witness and then an address underneath it. On the left, it has a shorthand summary of what that witness -- what I thought was important at the time when I read the statement of the witness. There is even a blank spot here for victim's mother. What I would do, I'd read the statements, I'd highlight the oral statements made by the defendants within those statements and try to write down the name of the

potential witnesses and what little bit they said on the side so that our victim witness legal assistant -- at the appropriate time, if the case wound up going to trial, when she needed to subpoena witnesses, she could go and find this and have all the witnesses' names and addresses ready for her to put on subpoenas and send out.

Q And where do you get the information that's on the left side of the list?

A That would be from my reading of the statement of that witness.

Q Now, I noticed that the second -- well, you actually have a summary with no name?

A That's right.

1.3

2.2

Q You have v's mother last to see alive. Do you know where that came from?

A There would have been -- one of the things I look for when I do a murder case is you try to identify the last person to see him alive and the first person to find him. Those are people always important when you're preparing a murder. At some point in the statement, I would have -- in the information the officer gave me, I would have read that his mother claimed to have seen him the last time alive. That's why I would have wrote that down. Now, I would have put on the victim's mother because one of the other things you have to do in a murder trial, if you've tried enough of them to know and I believe you

```
probably have, is you need to be able to identify who the
 1
 2
     victim is, who that person is, and you need somebody to
 3
     identify a live photograph of them. Usually, that's the mother
 4
     or the next of kin or somebody like that. So, I would have
 5
     written here victim's mother. I didn't know her name at the
 6
     time. Somewhere in there I would have read or saw a note that
 7
     she said or someone noted she was the last one to see him
 8
     alive, and that's why I would have written that. Where I found
     it in the file, I can't answer that.
10
               But it would have been in the file that the
11
     Rockingham Police Department sent to you?
12
               It should have been, yes. For me to have written
13
     that, I would have got it from somewhere.
14
               Mr. Parker, I've given you what I've marked for
     identification as Defendant's Exhibit 38 --
15
16
               THE COURT: I think that would be 39.
17
               THE WITNESS: You've got two 38s up here.
18
                            Okay. So, let's make this one 39.
               MR. COLEMAN:
19
                            Do you want me to do anything with it,
               THE WITNESS:
20
     Judge, or you want to fix it.
21
                           I'll fix it.
               THE COURT:
2.2
     BY MR. COLEMAN:
23
               Can you identify that document?
          Q
24
               This is my handwriting.
          Α
25
               Okay. Your handwriting, and can you tell me what the
          Q
```

document is? 1 2 It's just notes I made in the file. 3 Relating to what? 4 Well, it says Alan Davis owned house victim lived at 5 and then it's cut off, gave consent to search, nothing found in 6 house, and then found body. 7 And would you look at the next two pages of the 8 document? 9 Α Okay. 10 Can you tell, based on your note, what those two 11 pages are? 12 Not based on my note. I can tell you that this 13 purports to be an interview of Alan Davis by somebody other 14 than to me. 15 Correct. And your note refers to that interview? 16 No. My note refers to what Alan Davis may or may not 17 know. I don't know that it refers to this document. 18 Okay. But you can identify the second and third Q 19 pages as a report of the interview of Alan Davis conducted by 20 somebody? 21 It purports to be an interview of Alan Davis. 2.2 Q And if you look at the second page of that document, 23 you see two witnesses? 24 Yes. Α 25 And so you would assume that it purports to be a

```
document prepared by whom, or witnessed by whom?
 1
 2
               Well, that's already on McQuay and the other is PE
 3
     Sweat which would -- I'm pretty sure that would be Phil Sweat
     unless they had another officer by that name at the PD. I
 4
 5
     don't know.
 6
               So, the Alan Davis who is referred to in the second
 7
     and third pages of Defendant's Exhibit 39, is the Alan Davis as
 8
     the first witness on Defendant's Exhibit 37? Does that appear
     to be the case?
 9
10
               Wait a minute. This Alan Davis is the first witness
          Α
11
     on Defendant's Exhibit 37. I don't have 37.
12
               Okay. Maybe it's 38. Thirty-eight, your witness
     list?
13
               That's 38.
14
          Α
15
               Okay.
          Q
16
               So, yes.
          Α
17
          Q
               So, that's the document?
18
               Does it have the same address? 428 Hood Street.
          Α
19
     Yes, that should have been the same guy.
20
          Q
               Okay.
21
               Was that your question?
          Α
2.2
          Q
               Yes.
23
               MR. COLEMAN: I got to change an exhibit number.
24
     BY MR. COLEMAN:
25
               Mr. Parker, I'm giving you a chart that we prepared
```

that list the witnesses, as I understand it, who were developed in the investigation in this case. What I like to do is to look at Defendant's Exhibit 38, which is your witness list, to see if we can match up individuals on your list with the people on this exhibit?

A Okay.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'd object to the exhibit at this time. This is prepared evidence. I mean, we're talking about a case that finished 16 to 18 years ago and in addition, there is incorrect information or unsubstantiated information in this exhibit. It's the location of this statement and it lists all of them as Rockingham PD. There is no indication that that's the majority of these statements, where they were made, so based upon that, I'd object to asking this witness about this exhibit at this time.

MR. COLEMAN: May I respond to that.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I certainly don't intend to include anything on here that was not substantiated, and I think we can solve the problem by simply -- I'll cross out the location of statement. I just want to use this as a chart that organizes exhibits that have already been introduced into evidence. It has no substantive purpose other than to set out at one place the exhibits, the

statements that have already been entered into evidence.

MR. HAIGH: And Your Honor, the best evidence of these facts are the actual documents. Based upon that alone, this would be inadmissible.

THE COURT: I'm not going to admit it as substantive evidence in the case. I'm going to let both counsel and this witness, as well as counsel for the State, refer to this if this will help us move matters along and be able to match up witnesses to particular exhibits and statement dates because I think we've been over all of these exhibits and all of these dates at one time and sometimes several times.

BY MR. COLEMAN:

2.2

Q Something that I'd like to do, and see if we can do this very quickly is, Mr. Parker, if you will take the documents from the exhibits that are in front of you, and what I would like to do is to go down to your list of witnesses and see if we can match them to statements that have been introduced into evidence. So, let's begin with Thurmond Nelson who is a defendant in the case; correct? Codefendant?

A Yes.

Q And if you look at Defendant's Exhibit 33, which I believe is Mr. Nelson's statement.

A Okay.

Q Now, have you seen that document before?

I don't know. It's been 20 years since I've looked 1 2 at this discovery. 3 Other witnesses have identified it as the statement 4 that Thurmond Nelson --5 That's what it purports to be. 6 Q Thank you. The next -- just skip the mother because 7 you didn't have a statement for the mother; correct? I don't know if I did or not. 8 9 Let's take the next witness, Marlin Dumas, and if you 10 look at Defendant's Exhibit 8 --11 Α Okay. 12 What I'd like to ask you is whether that is the 13 statement given to the -- to your knowledge, if that's the 14 statement given to the Rockingham Police Department by Marlin 15 Dumas? 16 I don't know the answer to that. I don't know. 17 I know is it appears to be a statement purporting to be from 18 Marlin Dumas. I wasn't there when it was given. I assume it 19 came out of the case file because we're talking about it. 20 That's the best I can give you. I don't know. I wasn't there. 2.1 So, if other witnesses including --2.2 MR. HAIGH: Objection to what other witnesses 23 testified to. That's the second time counsel has tried to 24 introduce information --25 THE COURT: Let me see counsel up here at the bench.

1 (Bench conference with all counsel present.) 2 BY MR. COLEMAN: 3 So, Mr. Parker, what I'd like you to do is to -- you Q 4 see the footnotes on Defendant's Exhibit 40? 5 Yes, sir. 6 One through ten? 7 Α Yes, sir. If you were to look at those exhibits from the 8 footnotes of Defendant's 5, 8, 10, 7 -- and what I'd like to 9 10 ask you is whether you recognize them as statements that were 11 prepared by the Rockingham Police Department in this case? 12 Well, Defendant's Exhibit 8 appears to be a statement 13 written -- a statement from Marlin Maurice Dumas and it's 14 signed as a witness by Detective Brickman who was with the 15 Rockingham Police Department. So, I would say, I mean, I don't 16 -- I don't remember having -- I can't remember what I read 20 17 years ago. Do you understand what I'm saying? But this is 18 what that appears to be. So, I would say that's --19 Let me see if I can shortcut this. What is your 20 recollection of the evidence against Mr. McRae and Mr. Nelson? 21 That is, what is each of them supposed to have done that 2.2 resulted in the murder charge? 23 I can't answer that question. It's been 20 years 24 since I've read this stuff. I didn't read the statements. 25 haven't read them in 20 years. I can tell you from what I

recollect. I understand that McRae and Nelson were involved in going to a house and shooting Rankin on the porch. That's what I recall about this case.

Q And your recollection is that there was a witness who made a statement to the police claiming that he saw Mr. McRae and Mr. Nelson approach the victim and both of them fired their qun?

MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor. It's leading and it's compound.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that.

BY MR. COLEMAN:

2.2

Q Let me ask you on Defendant's Exhibit 38 -- tell me how you go about -- I think you may have mentioned this, but how do you go about making the notes on the left hand side of this exhibit?

A I would have read through the statements that correspond with these names, and I would have pulled out little snippets to remind me of what those witnesses were going to say. I would write it down on the side. The other benefit for this is that in the event our legal assistant starts subpoenaing or contacting these witnesses to come in, they may say, "I don't understand why do you need me," she would have something on the side to say, "Well, our evidence indicates you found Mr. Rankin's body, that's why we need to talk to you," that type of thing. This is just a shorthand way so that if

I'm trying to recollect at a later time which witness said a certain thing, I can look through the notes that would go with the statement without having to reread them all.

- Q And so, whatever statement you read, let's say with respect to Marlin Dumas, you concluded that he was, you said, secret eyewitness and then what does the rest of the note say?
 - A It says, "Said time about 12:30 a.m."

2.2

- Q Do you recall what 'secret' means here?
- A When you showed me this before, that to concerned me, and that was the one statement I went back and looked at. If I remember right, I think Mr. Dumas claimed in the statement that he had been threatened by Mr. McRae or by Nelson, I don't remember which. I just remember there being some threat alleged. I would have written that for the purpose of trying to protect his identity for as long as I could so that, in the event, there was some danger threat to him, that he would not be at risk.
- Q Okay. But he was an alleged eyewitness. Is that correct?
 - A From the statement I read, that's what I recollect.
- Q And he was the eyewitness who identified both Mr. Nelson and Mr. McRae as being at the crime scene?
 - A I don't know. I haven't read his statement.
- Q Well, why don't you read his statement -- Defendant's Exhibit 8?

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this 1 2 point. The statement is in evidence and this witness has 3 said that he has no personal recollection of what he read 4 20 years ago. 5 THE COURT: I'm going to give him an opportunity to 6 read the statement and see if, to any extent, it refreshes 7 his recollection. 8 Α Okay. 9 BY MR. COLEMAN: 10 That purports to be a statement of an eyewitness, is 11 that correct? 12 That's right. That's how I would characterize it. 1.3 Now, did you add to your list if you got additional 14 statements? 15 It depends. I can't say that I added to this one or 16 not. It would just depend on what came in and when. 17 How would you account for new statements that you 18 received, if there were any? 19 If there were new ones that came in and I had time to 20 do it, I would like to add to the list, sure, so that I can 21 keep a running tally of what's in there, the same thing as 2.2 before. 23 Do you recall whether you received additional 24 statements from the Rockingham Police Department during the

time you were responsible for this case?

A I don't recall that.

1.3

2.2

- 2 Q You don't recall receiving additional statements?
 - A I don't know. I may have, I may not have. I don't recall that.
 - O You don't have a recollection?
 - A That's a better answer, I don't recollect, no, sir.
 - Q Now, you were responsible for discovery, for complying with the -- your office's discovery obligations?
 - A Every prosecutor in the office who did Superior Court was responsible for discovery on every case there. That was, to me, one of the faults with the system we had at the time. We didn't have assigned felonies. Every prosecutor who was in court was responsible for the cases on the calendar. If you and I were running court, and you called in sick and the boss came in, he wouldn't want me to say, "Well, that was Mr. Coleman's case. I don't know the answer to it." He wanted everybody, both prosecutors, to be familiar with the facts in the case. So, in that way, we were all responsible for discovery in every case. I didn't like that system. I changed it when I got the chance, but, ultimately, everyone that was there was responsible for doing discovery.
 - Q Let me ask you to look at Defendant's Exhibit 1.
- 23 A Okay.
- 24 Q And you recognize that document?
- 25 A Yes.

What is it? 1 2 That's a General Felony Discovery form that I 3 developed. 4 So, does this indicate that the form had been 5 developed and was in use in the Derrick McRae case? 6 Yes, sir. 7 Can you tell us what the purpose of the form is? 8 The purpose is because all the prosecutors were 9 responsible for discovery. When we would go back to the file, 10 we didn't have a uniform way to tell what had been given and 11 what had not been turned over. I developed this form as an aid 12 to assist me in keeping track of what needed to go and what 13 went and when it went. So that if I, or any prosecutor, came 14 in after me could pick it up and see what had been given and what was left to be done. 15 16 Now, I believe before you took the stand, you 17 indicated that you thought there was an error on Exhibit 1, is that correct? 18 19 Right. I told Mr. Haigh that at lunch, and I came Α 20 and told you the same thing. And it's my mistake if, in fact, 2.1 it is. 2.2 And what is the error? 23 Do you have Thurmond Nelson's discovery sheet? 24 you have it in evidence? 25 Q Yes.

What number is it?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- It's not in evidence.
 - Okay. Well, Thurmond Nelson has a sheet that's identical to this. I would have done one for both defendants --
 - Let me mark it and give it to you.
 - That's fine.
 - What is Defendant's Exhibit 41?
 - That's the General Felony Discovery sheet that I completed for Thurmond Nelson's case.
- Okay. So you asked if we had a copy of that exhibit, 12 now, we do.

Yes, sir. Yesterday, I don't remember, you talked to me a couple of times before I came up here to testify that you had asked me about this sheet, and one of the things that confused me about this sheet from Derrick McRae was the fact that I noted that I had turned over the defendant's signed Waiver of Rights form. It was dated February 29th; '96, but according to my notes, I actually turned it over three days before it was signed. That didn't make sense to me, and so, when I went back and found Thurmond Nelson's, I noted on here that I noted I had turned over Thurmond Nelson's discovery on February 26 of '97, whereas I noted '96 on Derrick McRae's.

So, I'm 99.9 percent positive that I made an error when I wrote '96, it should have been '97 on Derrick McRae's

```
discovery because I would have done them both at the same time.
 1
 2
     There was no sense in doing one on a codefendant case and not
 3
     doing the other at the same time. So, that's the error and it
 4
     was my mistake.
 5
               So, this should be 2-26-97?
 6
               Yes, sir.
 7
               Now, as you -- and the discovery was an ongoing
 8
    process?
 9
               Oh, yes, sir. You never finish with --
          Α
10
               And so, as you're provided additional discovery,
11
     would you update this sheet?
12
               That's why it was made that way so that you could go
13
     through, and if you had new stuff come in, you would either
14
     create another sheet, if there was additional stuff you
15
     couldn't fit, or you would come over to this sheet and write
16
     down the number and the date of whatever it was and turn it
17
     over. Yes, so I would add to it if I had additional stuff to
18
     turn over.
19
               Let me ask you to look at Defendant's Exhibit 3?
20
          Α
               Okay.
2.1
               Can you identify that document?
          Q
2.2
          Α
               Yes.
               What is it?
23
          Q
24
               That is the Substance of Oral Statement of Derrick
```

It was a copy prepared for the defense attorney for

25

McRae.

discovery.

2.2

Q And can you explain how you prepare this and what it is that we see on this document?

A What you see is the substance of the oral statements of Derrick McRae that were contained in the interviews and information that were provided to me by the Rockingham Police Department.

Q So, you took this from the statements that the Rockingham Police Department provided you?

A Right. Or if I sat down and talked to an officer, I would typically ask them, "What did the defendant say to you?" Sometimes they would say nothing and it would be; well, did he open his mouth and words come out because I've got to write them down because that's what we wanted the substance.

The way I would prepare it would be I would read the statements in the file, and I would highlight the statement with a color specific for that defendant. That way, I could go back later and identify what statement came from -- which oral statement came from which written statement. This is a codefendant, there should have been two highlighter colors. There would probably be orange and green or I could use blue and yellow or something like that. I didn't like yellow because you couldn't see it well, but what you would do is I would read this statement, I would highlight the name, I would then come over and put the witnesses' name and address on my

sheet with a little note about what they said and I would then type up the substance of those highlighted statements on a form.

I kept two forms. The first form was mine. I called it the State's copy because I broke it down so that I would have each witness and which statement the witness gave as to which oral statement is attached to it. The reason I wanted to do that was if the Court ever ordered me to turn over to the defense where it came from, I wouldn't have to go hunting through 15 different sheets of paper. I could pull it up and find what statement and which witness it came from.

Once I completed that form, I copied it on my computer and I would take out the names and the dates of the individual witnesses and then prepare a nice typed substance of oral statement form like this that I would turn over to the lawyer.

- Q So, the document that you provided to defense counsel did not identify the witness?
 - A That's right. We weren't required to do that.
 - O Did not indicate the date?
 - A No, sir.

2.1

2.2

- Q Did not indicate the circumstances?
- A It was the substance. Now, sometimes circumstances could be indicated if it helped explain the circumstances. I haven't read this so, I can't say specifically which one. If

you read a statement, and the witness said did you kill Johnny, and the defendant said yes, the substance of that statement is not yes, the substance of that statement is yes, I killed Johnny or whatever. That's the substance so, that's what you would turn over. Sometimes that substance was based on circumstance, and if that were necessary to understand the statement, that would be included.

- Q Can you tell me, generally, what did your office turn over to a defendant in a criminal case during this period?
 - A What was required by statute.

1.3

2.2

Q And one witness said the minimum that was required, would you say that's accurate?

A I would say we turned over what was statutorily required. That was the office policy and that was how I was trained to do it at the time. Now, there was actually additional stuff turned over here that went beyond that because I've seen in some of the stuff that Mr. Lau sent me. There was a note I made about telling Mr. Crump to check the defendant's file because we were going to use that and that's not necessarily spelled out in the statute but that was to give him an opportunity to look at that and see if he wanted to object to it or whatever.

- Q Would you turn over the statements the witness statements from which you took the oral statements?
- A Typically not, unless they became relevant at a later

time as Brady material or by defendant's request under the (inaudible) Act.

- Q Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 42?
- A Yes.

1.3

2.2

Q What is it?

A This is Derrick McRae's substance of oral statement, State's copy, and this is the one that I would prepare for me so I could reference where those statements came from if I needed to reveal it. And I will tell you that apparently that synopsis thing you were asking me about earlier, it was in my file because the top one says that came from the synopsis. I don't know where that statement would have come from -- where the officer who wrote it got it from, but that should be in that synopsis.

Q And, likewise, for each of the witnesses that you identify, this refers to the statement that the witness gave on that date, is that correct?

A That refers to the substance of oral statements taken from the statement given on that day. If the witness came back and gave three or four later, then you could add to it with a different statement date because I've had some cases where you've got five and six statements from witnesses, and if you're trying to link up the substance of them to them, it's very confusing, that's why I did this. I don't know if anybody else in my office did this, but this is the way that I would do

it. 1 2 But from this, we can tell that on November 17, 3 1996 -- is that the date that it was prepared? 4 That's the date that I would have printed it out. 5 That you printed it out. Do you know when you would 6 have prepared it? 7 No. I can tell you that I had -- this was on my 8 Macintosh -- my personal Macintosh computer. It was a little laptop. It was one of the first ones that ever came out and 10 nobody else in the office had them. I was playing with it and 11 I'm pretty sure what I did was put down here the date, insert 12 date, you know, that little one. So, anytime I printed it out 13 I would get a new date. So I can tell you that in this, this 14 one was printed out 11-17, so I prepared it or did it on or 15 about that day. 16 And so, on whatever date you prepared this, these are 17 the statements that you had and these are the statements from 18 which you obtained the oral statements? 19 These are the oral statements. Α 20 Yes. 0 2.1 Those should be the same thing that's in his copy. Α 2.2 Q Correct. 23 And I would have printed them both on the same day and that shows the same thing. 24

If you would look at the Defendant's Exhibit 1.

There are four columns. One is notes, and there is a date, 11-17-96, opposite oral statements. Does that refresh your recollection of what this date -- the date that this document may have been created?

2.2

A No. What that tells me is I printed this -- that tells me this, if I later went back and added oral statements and I printed out another sheet, it would have a different date. I would want to know that I turned over -- that if there is a question that came up about the oral statements I provided him, I would go back to this document dated November 11-17-96, so that I could reference this is what I gave him on -- I gave it to him on February 26th of what I believe to be '97. That's how I would do that. If I had another document with a different date, I'd come back under here and I'd write another oral statement, you know, two pages, the due date, and then a date over there so I could tell this one from the next one that comes down the line.

- Q So that this document, Defendant's Exhibit 1, would be updated as you provided additional information?
 - A It could be updated or I could create a second one.
 - Q Or you could create a second one?
- A Right. Most of the prosecutors in the office handwrote theirs. I had that new computer and I typed mine.
- Q But you would have created a General Felony Discovery form to reflect any discovery that you would provide?

And I encouraged all of our prosecutors to use 1 2 I had them printed and put in all the offices. 3 Okay. Would this document reflect the complete Q 4 record of what you provided in discovery? 5 Which document? 6 The General Felony Discovery form, Defendant's 7 Exhibit 1? This document -- it reflects what I provided on 8 9 whatever date this says, okay. If I turned over anything else, 10 and I don't have something like this, I can't swear to you that 11 I turned it over to them. If it's not on here, I can't tell 12 you that I did or I didn't. That's why I used that form was to 13 report. This was before we started Bates stamping which was a 14 great innovation for us to Bates stamp and then give out the 15 documents with numbers on them. This was my attempt before 16 that of trying to keep track of it and bring some order out of 17 the chaos that you could get into on a big case. 18 Did you have a way to keep track of things that you Q 19 were doing in your cases? 20 What do you mean? 21 That is, something that indicated -- did you prepare 2.2 a to do list? 23 Α Yes.

the purpose of the to do list?

And can you tell us what your to do list -- what was

24

- A Remind me of stuff to do.
 - Q How did it work?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

A If I saw a need for something, I would write it down on the list and then I would try to contact the officer at some point in time, and I would say I need a diagram or a photograph or a lot of the times one of the big things was a live photograph of the victim. I need you to get that for me to complete the file and do discovery. As they would come in, I would mark it off. I would keep the to do list in a certain place in the file, so that I could pull up a file and see what was left or needed to be done as you were working on it.

- Q And did you add to the list as you identified projects that needed to be done?
 - A You could add it to the list, yes.
 - Q Did you generally try to add to the list?
- A I would, unless, I finished all of it on one page and then I would typically throw that paper away and start a new to do list. It was something very satisfying to me about marking off things that needed to be done.
 - Q Can you identify this document?
- A Yes.
- 22 Q What is it?
- 23 A This is one of my to do lists.
- Q Okay. This is a list that you created of things that you wanted to do in the case.

1 A Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

21

2.2

23

24

- Q And where was the list kept?
 - A It was kept in the file. Eventually, I actually developed a filing system where we had everything in the same place in the files. Generally, this list was kept either on the left side of the front hand when you would open up the file so it would be one of the first things you would see.
 - Q And the items that are crossed out, what does that indicate?
 - A That indicates I was satisfied or couldn't get them and I didn't need to do that anymore.
 - Q Either it had been done or you no longer --
- A Or it couldn't be done. Right.
- Q And items that are not crossed out are things that remain to be done?
- 16 A Right or that need to be done.
- 2 So, in this case; get a witness list, do discovery?
- 18 A Right.
- 19 Q Now, that get witness list or get WI list, was that 20 the list that we just talked about earlier?
 - A It could have been that. That's usually what I mean is to get the witness list, to write down a list like that. It can also be -- now, usually if it's ordered, I would say put in witness order. There was a difference between a witness list and a witness order.

Now, one of the items that you have here is go to 1 2 scene. 3 Right. Α 4 Is that for you personally to go to the scene? 5 If I was trying the case, I tried to go to the scene. 6 And did you go to the scene of this -- of this crime? Q 7 I don't recall going to the scene. Α 8 But does the cross out indicate that you may have 9 gone to the scene? 10 It indicates that, but if I did -- I don't know if I 11 crossed it out. I know that I wrote it because that's my 12 handwriting. I don't know if I crossed it out or not and I 13 don't have any independent recollection of going to the scene. 14 Now, this would have indicated -- now, if you've got pictures 15 of it, I could look at it and see if I can remember, haven't 16 seen it before. 17 I do. 18 But now, this would have indicated that either I 19 didn't need to go, or I did go and I was satisfied with what I 20 saw. 21 Can you tell me why you would have wanted to go to 2.2 the scene? 23 I always like to go to the scene because it helps you

So, you go to the scene to try to understand what a

to visualize what the witnesses say.

24

witness claims to have seen from his vantage point?

A Or, more often, I find things of interest to me that would lead me to new evidence that I can go and find that type of thing. It helps you to be prepared to try the case.

Q I'm going to show you what I'm marking now as Defendant's Exhibit 43 - 44. Mr. Parker, do you recognize this document, this photograph?

A No.

1.3

2.2

Q It doesn't refresh your recollection about the scene?

A No.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$ Let me ask you to look at the photograph on the easel in front of you.

A Okay.

Q Does that look familiar to you?

A No. What's on that easel would have been what I said, get town map of the area, if that includes the location of this residence. The other thing I notice on my to do list is I say get new scene photos, which tends to indicate to me that I would have gone out there or ridden by and not been satisfied with what they had turned over. According to this, I made a note — and that's my handwriting — that those were taken on November the 13th which I notice I've also — about four days before I did oral statements, so that tells me that I would have probably been working this case during that month, that week of November.

```
1
          Q
               Okay.
 2
               But as far as remembering this place, I don't recall
 3
     this. I may have gone. I can't tell you how many I've done,
 4
     and I just can't remember them all.
 5
               Where would the photographs, assuming they were taken
 6
     on November 13th '96, where would they be?
 7
               They would have been taken by the PD or the Sheriff's
          Α
 8
     office because sometimes the sheriffs would do the crime scene
     for the PD, and then they should have had a copy turned over to
10
     us.
11
               Let me ask you to look at the second page of your to
12
     do list.
               I'm not sure about the second page, is that also your
13
     list?
14
               That's my handwriting. Now, whether or not it's part
          Α
15
     of this to do list or not I don't know, but that's my
16
     handwriting.
17
               And it asks questions. So those would have been
18
     questions that you would have asked?
19
               Those are questions I would have asked the officer.
          Α
20
               Okay. 'Did we interview Jeremy Sturdevant?' Do you
          0
21
     see that?
2.2
          Α
               Yes.
23
               The note there -- what is the note?
          Q
24
               Which one, there's two?
          Α
               Yes. To the left.
25
          Q
```

"Yes, but refused to talk,' and then I drew an arrow 1 2 to Johnny McRae interview. I don't know what that means. Okay. But, 'yes, refused to talk' would be 3 Q 4 information you obtained from the officer? 5 Yes. 6 And based on this note, you would have assumed that 7 the officer said that -- told you that he attempted to interview Mr. Sturdevant, but he refused to talk? 8 9 Yes. And it has something to do with Johnny McRae's 10 interview from Serena Parker because I made an arrow to it, but 11 I don't have any independent recollection of what that is. 12 Did you have a practice in cases to file a motion in 1.3 limine to exclude a defendant's statement? 14 Self-serving statement. Α 15 Self-serving statement? 0 16 Yes. Α 17 Q Can you explain what that is? 18 I'm just trying to figure out whether you want -- how Α 19 long an answer you want. 20 Go with the short answer. 21 Okay. If the defense lawyer attempts to introduce a 2.2 defendant's statement in evidence from one of my witnesses, 23 then that statement is hearsay because it's not offered by a 24 party opponent. I had an issue with a lawyer in Anson County,

Hank Drake, very fine lawyer who loved to try to do that, and I

developed this motion in order to put him on notice that if he asked my officers questions about what his client said, I'm going to object to it because it's hearsay and I want to be able to offer it myself or let him put his client on the stand at the appropriate time and then I could cross examine him.

My whole goal was I wanted to be able to cross examine the defendant about claims of self-defense or alibi or whatever he may have told the officer. I filed that in every case whether I intended to use the confession or not. It was just a standard motion I used.

- Q Did you at some point assign this case to a different prosecutor?
 - A Yes.

1.3

2.2

- Q Do you recall to whom you assigned it?
- A Scott Brewer.
- Q Do you recall when that occurred?
- 17 A I'm sorry?
- 18 Q When that occurred?

A I don't know. I've been trying to find when I signed it to him, and I can't answer that question for you. I know that when I was promoted to chief assistant, we had 41 murders pending then or shortly thereafter in Richmond County by itself. I was trying to go through and do discovery on all of these cases. I could work three at a time, and if you ever added a fourth one, I got confused and I had to guit. But I

would try to get the discovery out to the defense lawyer, so we could start talking about a plea.

I know that I got promoted around August of '96 and I worked on those cases. At the time, there were only, like, two people in the office who tried murder cases and one of Ken Honeycutt's goals at the time was to involve other prosecutors and try them. So we started assigning them -- I started assigning them out based on the prosecutor's skill. I cannot recall when I assigned this case to Scott. I do know that I had a -- I tried Philip Dawkins in 1997. Scott tried Josh Griffin between '97 and '98, and then my Philip Dawkins trial hung, and I had to retry it during the same time this was going on. We moved, I think, 30 or 40 murders that year in '96 or '97 across the district. I want to say it was probably around the middle part of '97 that I assigned that case to him. would have been after I turned over -- it would have been after February of '97 because that was when I did discovery on the case, but it would have been sometime around -- it would have been sometime after that. That's a lawyer's answer to a Short answer is I don't know. question.

- Q Once you turned the case over to him, would the responsibility for discovery then shift to him?
 - A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q Mr. Parker, can you identify the handwriting on this document?

1 Α Yes. Whose handwriting is it? 2 Q 3 Α That's Scott Brewer's. 4 And do you have an opinion about what this document 5 is? 6 MR. HAIGH: Objection. Calls for speculation. 7 THE COURT: I'll let you restate your question. 8 not going to let you offer an opinion about what it is. 9 I'll sustain that. 10 BY MR. COLEMAN: 11 Do you know what this document purports to be? 12 It purports to be the witness order. 1.3 Did you have any role in the case at this point? 14 This would have been done by the prosecutor Α 15 taking it to trial. I mentioned to you before, there's a 16 difference between a witness list and a witness order. A 17 witness list has all the witnesses you know of that you're 18 writing down. Then you go through and you interview those 19 witnesses and you decide which ones you are going to use and 20 you put together an order, which is, which ones you're going to 21 call first, second, third and what they're going to testify to. This appears to be a witness order. 2.2 23 Can you tell me in a case involving codefendants, who 24 had the authority to negotiate a deal with one of the

codefendants in the office at the time of this case?

1 Α You're talking about the murder cases --2 0 Murder cases. 3 Murder cases, Ken Honeycutt. 4 And he would be the person who ultimately would 5 decide what a witness would receive who has testified for the 6 State? 7 In a murder case --8 In a murder case. We're talking about murder cases? It didn't matter if there was a codefendant or not. 9 10 At this time, Ken was the one who made the plea offers on the 11 cases. The prosecutor who was assigned to work on them -- and 12 this is one of the things I did as chief assistant was I spent 13 a lot of time trying to find out from lawyers, does your 14 client -- is he interested in a plea? Let's get your discovery 15 and then work to try to get the two of them together so they 16 could reach a resolution to the case, but he was the one who 17 had the authority to make the plea offers. 18 That's all I have, Your Honor. MR. COLEMAN: 19 THE COURT: Before you start your examination, noting 20 the hour, why don't we go ahead and take a break. 2.1 be in recess for about 15 minutes. 2.2 (Court in recess for afternoon break.) 23 THE COURT: Mr. Parker, if you'll come back to the 24 stand, please, sir.

Questions, Mr. Haigh.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HAIGH:

1.3

2.2

Q Now, Mr. Parker, you testified on direct that your memory was a little bit fuzzy as to what may or may not have been in the prosecutor's file at this point today, is that right?

A That's right.

Q So, it's fair to say that in looking at documents now, barring those that may have your handwriting on them, you may not know what's been added or what has been potentially removed, is that right?

A That's right.

Q If you wouldn't mind taking a look at Defense Exhibit 43 and Defendant's Exhibit one.

A Okay.

Q Now, you'll see on Defendant's Exhibit 43, you had do discovery about two thirds of the way down on that page and that's not crossed out?

A That's right.

Q But when you look at Defendant's Exhibit 1, you clearly have submitted discovery based upon that, is that right?

A I had provided discovery of what I had in this.

Q So, what, if any, distinction exist between Defendant's Exhibit 43 with regard to that and Defendant's

Exhibit 1?

1.3

2.2

A Well, Defendant's Exhibit 1 shows what I turned over while I was working this case on this. I do notice that on Defendant's Exhibit 43 -- do you see the one that says 'do OS'?

That OS is oral statements. So, I have already done

O Yes.

those, and I marked them out. So, I know that that mark would have taken place after November 17, of '96 to turn it over.

There could have been additional things in this discovery that I was waiting for to come in because most prosecutors know that discovery is never done and it's a continuing process. You wind up turning over stuff all the way up to and through trial.

Q So, is it fair to say that that may have remained not crossed out through the duration just as a reminder to disclose whatever came in the door?

A Well, it could be. I wouldn't have done that. There was something specific. If I didn't mark it out, there was something that I was waiting for, and I don't know what it was.

Q Now, you handled this case from the moment of indictment up through the time that it was handed over to Judge Brewer, is that right?

A Yeah, I mean, I would have been responsible for it.

Q And is your testimony that you don't really recall exactly when that transition occurred?

A No.

Q And there was a case that Judge Brewer, you mentioned previously, was trying at one point preceding this case that brought him up into the middle of -- or beginning of year 1998, do you recall that?

2.2

A Yes. I went back and looked at my notes on disposed murders and I noticed that he was trying a case with Donna Step and Ken Honeycutt in Monroe called the Josh Griffin case. That was a police officer who killed a motorist. I don't know if you remember it, and I think, according to my notes, that case was over March the 8th.

Q So, would it be fair to infer then that it was shortly there after that case got resolved that he would have been assigned this case?

A I'm not going to say that because when I start signing out cases, it would have been in '96 or '97. It wasn't a secret who got them. I had a large board that I would put prosecutors names across the top and months of the year. Each murder got its own index card and I would assign it by placing it in the month and the name of the prosecutor it was assigned to try. That would have taken place during '96 and '97.

I would have notified the prosecutor you're working or handling so and so case because we were assigning murder cases. Richmond County was our worst county at that time. I mean, there were like 40 pending homicides. The rule was that we were supposed to be handling a murder every time the court

house doors opened up we need to be trying one or doing something with it. So, there's no way one or two prosecutors could do it, so we started assigning those cases to prosecutors outside of Richmond County like Hunt Quinn. He did Jerry Hamilton down here; Scott did McRae. I did Philip Dawkins and we tried a bunch of those that way. And so that way, they would rotate in, they would do their case and they would leave. So he could have been assigned that case months before, but I can tell you that remembering the Josh Griffin case — they worked on that case pretty solid forever. I think that case was like a three month trial, and they worked on that, I know, for months prior to that. So I don't know what time he would have — I don't know when I gave it to him or when he would have known he had it. I can't find those notes.

- Or when he would have been able to work on it?
- A Now, that's true, I don't know.
- Q But it's fair to say that at some point, the duties and records associated with this case transitioned from you to Judge Brewer?
 - A Yes.
- Q And with regard to any offers that may have been made to witnesses or codefendants in this case -- well, do you recall any offers being made?
- A No.

2.2

25 Q And at least --

A Well, no, let me say this. I remember having heard after the fact of the discussions that Scott had with the lawyer for McRae about a plea in that case. I mean, I was trying another murder case then, and I didn't hear about that until after the fact, so I don't know what discussions were made before.

Q All right. And that's with Mr. McRae, the defendant, right?

A Yes.

2.2

- Q I'm talking about other witnesses or codefendants?
- A No. I don't know anything about those.
 - Q You didn't hear anything about any offers or any deals being made with those kinds of people?

A No. If they had done that, and I had known about it, I would have written it down somewhere and put it in the file, and I would have turned that over.

Q And generally speaking, with you running the office in Richmond County, wouldn't you have known whether that was the case in a murder trial? If there was a deal pending in that context?

A I would like to think so, but if Ken had negotiated the case outside of my presence, because, you know -- you remember, at this time, I was getting ready to try Philip Dawkins again, so I don't know what was going on down here. I was working that case up for two or three months before that.

```
I should have heard, and I should have known about it if it
 1
 2
     happened, yes.
 3
               Okay. So, it's fair to say then, that Ken Honeycutt
 4
     is the ultimate person that would have had authority or
 5
     knowledge about any deals or offers being made?
 6
               Yes. Now, sometimes he would tell the prosecutor,
 7
     this is what we got, you need to get X, Y and Z out of them,
     and the prosecutor would go and try to negotiate the plea that
 8
     way, but ultimately, he was the one who decided what pleas were
10
     made on murder cases.
11
               Okay. And Scott Brewer, given that he tried the
12
     case, he would have had knowledge if there were any such deals?
1.3
               If there was one, he should have known.
14
               All right. But you can't really say one way or the
15
     other?
16
               I can say I don't remember any.
17
               Again with disclosure, you wouldn't have any
18
     knowledge of what was disclosed after this case was turned over
19
     to Mr. Brewer than either, would you?
20
               No, sir.
21
               All right. Similarly, you would have no knowledge of
2.2
     what may have been disclosed at trial, whether via (inaudible)
23
     motion or by way of Mr. Brewer just turning over a statement
24
     after a witness testified?
```

I wouldn't know that.

25

No.

Nothing further. 1 MR. HAIGH: 2 THE COURT: Any? MR. COLEMAN: Just a couple of questions. 3 4 THE COURT: Sure. 5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. COLEMAN: 7 On plea deals and agreements, if Mr. Honeycutt 8 negotiated one and didn't tell you, you wouldn't know about it? 9 That's true. 10 And you have no way of knowing what deals he 11 negotiated? 12 If he had negotiated a deal with a lawyer, and I made 13 the lawyer an offer that wasn't that way, the lawyer would have 14 told me. Do you see what I'm saying? If he negotiated and 15 didn't tell me, I wouldn't know unless the defense lawyer told 16 me. 17 You indicated that you would go to a crime scene so 18 that you could see for yourself different perspectives and then 19 you would follow that with having photographs made. Can you 20 explain the approach you would take for the photographs that 21 were made? How do you stage them? 2.2 I never stage a photograph. I would take a 23 photograph of the scene, of the area, and what I like to do is 24 to get a macro photograph so that you could help the jurors to 25 visualize and see what was actually happening out there, like,

you would start with an overhead, an aerial diagram, and then 1 2 you would peg the photograph. This is a photograph that I 3 would have liked to have had made. If this is where the murder 4 took place, I don't know but if it is, you start from the back 5 and you come forward smaller so that you can relate what's 6 around it to what is actually there. It's called macro to 7 micro photography and it's a forensic technique. 8 MR. COLEMAN: That's it, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Any? 10 MR. HAIGH: Just one thing. A follow-up to make sure I understood. 11 12 RECROSS EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. HATGH: I want to revisit Defendant's Exhibit 45 for a 14 15 So, you only testified as what this purports to be, moment. 16 right? 17 That's right. 18 You have no personal knowledge of what this actually Q 19 is by the creator of this document? 20 That's right. Α 21 You have no personal knowledge of whether the 2.2 contents of this document are accurate or not, is that right? 23 Α I didn't write it. 24 Thank you. Q 25 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down.

```
1
               THE WITNESS: I don't know if it's appropriate, but
 2
     can I be released.
 3
               THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Parker.
 4
               THE WITNESS:
                             Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
               MR. COLEMAN:
                             Your Honor, at this time we'd like to
 6
          move the admissions of Exhibits 36 through 39 and 41
 7
          through 45, not 40.
 8
               MR. HAIGH: And, Your Honor, I'd object to the one we
 9
          just discussed, because --
10
                          Number 45 is the last one we discussed.
11
                           I would object to this one, Your Honor
               MR. HAIGH:
12
          because the witness wasn't able to lay a foundation for
1.3
          it.
14
               THE COURT: What do you say to that, Mr. Coleman.
15
               MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, he identified it.
16
          doesn't know what it is. He knows what it purports to be
17
          based on the general practice in the office, and he was
18
          able to identify the handwriting as that of the prosecutor
19
          in this case.
20
                           I'm going to admit it for whatever value
               THE COURT:
21
          it might have.
2.2
                    (Defendant Exhibits 36 - 39 and 41 - 45 were
23
                    admitted.)
24
               MR. COLEMAN: We will call James Van Camp.
25
               THE COURT: Yes, sir, Mr. Van Camp.
```

The witness, James Vancamp, was sworn and 1 2 testified as follows to the Examination of 3 counsel. 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. COLEMAN: 6 Mr. Van Camp, would you state your name, where you 7 live, and your place of employment. James Irvine Van Camp. I live in Southern Pines, 8 9 North Carolina. My offices are in Pinehurst. 10 And how long have you practiced law? 11 Forty-nine years. 12 Q And have you practiced law in this jurisdiction? 13 I have. You're talking about in Richmond County? Α 14 Yes. Q 15 Yes. Α 16 In Superior Court in Richmond County? Q 17 Α Yes. 18 And can you just briefly describe other areas of the 19 state where you practice law, and why don't we limit it to 20 murder cases and major felonies. Does that narrow it down any? 21 I wasn't sure of the question, but I would say most 2.2 of the state I practiced in and had murder cases in most areas 23 of the state. 24 And you practice in federal court as well as state court? 25

1 In all three divisions, yes. 2 Does your practice consist of representing criminal 3 defendants? 4 Part of my practice, yes. 5 Do you recall the case of State of North Carolina 6 versus Thurmond Nelson, a murder case? 7 I remember the name. 8 Do you recall that you were counsel to Mr. Nelson in 9 that case? 10 I have refreshed my recollection that I was. 11 Did you represent him alone or did you represent him 12 along with other lawyers from your firm? 13 I understand that Mr. Mechium sat in on one occasion, but the others -- I know one occasion when I was unavailable 14 and I had a conflict with another. 15 16 Even when that happened, you remained counsel to the 17 client? 18 Yes. Α 19 Now, have you represented clients who have testified 20 as witnesses in cases in Richmond County? That is defendants 21 who have testified on behalf of the State in this county? 2.2 I only know of this one. I can't recollect any 23 others. 24 Have you represented witnesses in this county who

have testified for the State?

25

At this time, I don't recollect that. 1 2 Are you familiar with the customary practice in this 3 county for deciding whether a witness who testifies for the 4 State receives a benefit for doing so? 5 MR. HAIGH: Object, Your Honor, of facts not in 6 evidence. 7 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that general question. I'll let you be specifically direct with 8 reference to any of these matters, if you wish to do so, 9 10 Mr. Coleman. 11 BY MR. COLEMAN: Do you recall that Mr. Nelson testified in this 12 13 case -- the case involving Mr. McRae? 14 Α Yes. 15 And he testified for the State, is that your 16 recollection? 17 That's my recollection. 18 And do you recall whether he received a benefit as a 19 result of his testimony? 20 I cannot say as a result of his testimony. I know 21 the result of the case. As I understand it, the case against 2.2 him was dismissed, but I don't know that it was the benefit for 23 him testifying. 24 Do you know if, when Mr. Nelson testified, he had an 25 expectation of the prosecutor taking into consideration his

testimony? 1 2 MR. HAIGH: Objection. Goes to another person's 3 knowledge or expectation, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain it as to the form of 5 question. I'll let you restate your question, 6 Mr. Coleman. 7 BY MR. COLEMAN: 8 Did you, as Mr. Nelson's counsel, did you have any expectation that if he testified for the State, he would 9 10 receive a benefit? 11 Α Yes. And what was the basis for the expectation? 12 13 You're talking about in 1997? 14 Yes. '98. Q It was generally understood, I understood it, that if 15 16 a defendant cooperated, there would be some consideration for 17 that, for that cooperation. 18 And when you say some consideration, what do you 19 mean? 20 There would be some -- in the result of his case if 21 he had a pending case and the result of his case. 2.2 case, Mr. Nelson's case. 23 In this case, would you have permitted Mr. Nelson to 24 testify without that expectation? 25 That certainly would have been up to Mr. Nelson, but

I certainly would have advised him -- I don't know what the 1 2 privileges are here in terms of client privilege. I would have 3 advised him probably that he did not have to do that, testify. And can you explain how the benefit to the client 5 would be realized? When would it be realized? 6 It was not defined. There was never any definitive 7 understanding about that except there would be some 8 consideration. So, the understanding was that there would be some 9 10 consideration and then at some later point, the actual 11 consideration would be decided? 12 That would be decided by the District Attorney's 13 Office, yes. 14 Did you deal with a particular lawyer in the District Attorney's Office in reaching that result? 15 16 I don't recollect that. 17 Do you know who in Richmond County made the decision 18 about the benefit? 19 In 1998? Α 20 Correct. 0 2.1 It was the District Attorney, Mr. Honeycutt. Α 2.2 Q And would you or Mr. Mechium have dealt directly with 23 him? 24 I would have to speculate. I don't know that I did. 25 I have no recollection of dealing with Mr. Honeycutt in this

1 case, personally. 2 So, did the fact that Mr. Nelson testified benefit 3 him in the end based on your personal knowledge? 4 MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your honor. The witness has 5 already answered previously that he doesn't know whether 6 the result was directly from the fact that he testified or 7 the value or merit of the case of his client. 8 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that particular 9 question. Sustain the objection. 10 BY MR. COLEMAN: 11 After your client testified, how did you go about 12 deciding how charges pending against him would be disposed of? 1.3 I have no recollection of how that happened. 14 been 17 years. I know the result, at least I've been told what 15 the result is. I don't know the process. 16 And what is the result? 17 I understood that the first-degree murder case was dismissed. 18 19 And was it your belief that that result was affected 20 by his decision to testify? 2.1 It would certainly have been a factor in that, but I 2.2 can't tell you how much of one or how it was factored into the 23 decision by the District Attorney's Office. 24 Do you know how the District Attorney went about

deciding how a case would be disposed of after a witness

25

testifies? 1 2 No. 3 Do you personally believe, based on -- well, first of 4 all, how did your client come to testify for the State in this 5 case, do you recall that? 6 I do not recall. I know he did, but I do not how 7 that came about. And you don't have any idea how that came about? 8 9 If you want me to speculate how that happened, I can 10 do that, but I have no recollection of what the process was 11 that brought him to testify, other than obviously, there was a 12 discussion between he and I about that, but other than that, I 13 don't know about the process. 14 Do you know if you or Mr. Mechium were present when Mr. Nelson testified in the second trial? 15 16 Mr. Mechium, I understand, was present when he 17 testified. 18 Do you recall whether there was occasion when 19 Mr. Nelson testified without his lawyer being present? 20 I don't know that. 21 Do you believe that in the case, the murder case 2.2 against Mr. Nelson, after he testified, that it would have been 23 possible for the prosecutor to prosecute him on the murder 24 charge?

MR. HAIGH: Objection. Speculation.

25

1 THE COURT: That's sustained. 2 BY MR. COLEMAN: 3 I'm asking for your assessment of his exposure if he testified. What was his exposure on the murder charge? 4 5 assessment of his exposure? 6 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object to facts 7 not in evidence. Mr. Van Camp has already said he wasn't 8 present for the defendant's testimony, therefore, he 9 wouldn't know. 10 I'm going to let him testify, if he has an opinion, as to an assessment. Do you have an 11 12 assessment about that, Mr. Van Camp. 1.3 THE WITNESS: obviously, had he incriminated himself 14 in the factual basis of the case, that would have been a 15 factor as to his culpability and his possibility of being 16 prosecuted. 17 BY MR. COLEMAN: 18 Based on his testimony that he was not involved in Q 19 the murder, did you believe that he had any exposure? 20 Based upon his testimony, no. 2.1 MR. COLEMAN: That's all I have, Your Honor. 2.2 THE COURT: Cross-examination. 23 MR. HAIGH: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 CROSS EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. HAIGH:

Mr. Van Camp, I just want to go into the process between you, as counsel, and the interactions with the State in this case for a little bit. So, correct me if I'm wrong, but isn't it true that the State would actually make no offer to a witness such as Thurmond Nelson in exchange for his testimony? The word 'offer' is somewhat -- there would be no specific offer. And in fact, isn't it more of an expectation on the part of the defense attorney that suggest their client cooperate that the State will take that into consideration? Α Yes. So, that's a fair characterization. And based upon that, isn't it true that you may suggest in a nebulous manner to your client that if you testify, the State may consider that in the disposition of your case? There would be a consideration. Right. But you would never go to your client and say, "If you testify, you're going to get X, or there's going 19 to be a quaranteed effect." In this district, that was never the way it was done. It was just an understanding. So, when your client testified that he didn't have a deal with the State, that was a true statement, isn't that 23

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

24

25

correct?

Α

Yes.

1 Q Thank you. 2 THE COURT: Any further questions, Mr. Coleman? 3 MR. COLEMAN: Just one. 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COLEMAN: 5 6 Have you ever had a client who testified for the 7 State who did not receive a benefit? On one occasion. I recall that the client recanted 8 9 and changed his testimony based upon a previous debriefing, it 10 was in federal court, and he did not receive --11 I'm talking about in this district? 12 In this district, I don't believe so. 1.3 Thank you. Q 14 RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HAIGH: 15 16 And I recall your initial testimony on direct was 17 that this is the only case -- Mr. McRae's case or Mr. Nelson's 18 case is the only case that you can recall doing as a murder 19 case in Rockingham in Superior, is that right? 20 I've had several murder cases in Richmond County. 2.1 During Ken Honeycutt's tenure as prosecutor? 2.2 I'm sure I did. I can't give you names now, but we 23 had several here during -- of course, for a period of time, he 24 was our district attorney too, until Moore County was taken and 25 given to Randolph in Montgomery.

1	Q	Thank you, sir.					
2		THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Van Camp. You may be					
3	excused and released from your subpoena.						
4		MR. LAU: May we approach, Your honor.					
5		THE COURT: Yes, counsel, you may approach.					
6		(Bench conference with all counsel present.)					
7		THE COURT: All right, folks. We're going to go					
8	ahea	d and break a little early today. We will start					
9	prom	ptly at 9:30 in the morning.					
10		Sheriff, we'll be in recess until 9:30 in the					
11	morning.						
12							
13		(Court adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)					
14							
15		END OF VOLUME II OF III					
16							
17	* * * *	*******					
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

STATE	OF	NORTH	CAROLINA	,
				,
COUNTY	Z OE	RICHN	MOND)

CERTIFICATE

I, Patrice B. Lee, the officer before whom the foregoing proceeding was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, inclusive, are a true, correct and verbatim transcript of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was heard; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, and am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name, this 28th day of November, 2016.

Patrice B. Lee

Patrice B. Lee, CVR-CM Official Court Reporter Superior Court 704-287-3609